OCTOBER 1967

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 19

5

Two views on the ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT

PAUL M. SWEEZY • LEO HUBERMAN

Articles by:

JAMES ARONSON
JOHN GERASSI
MAXWELL GEISMAR
HERBERT MARCUSE
SCOTT NEARING

Fanon Revisited by JOHN A. EHRENREICH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME NINETEEN NUMBER FIVE OCTOBER 1967

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Israeli-Arab Conflict—
ISRAEL AND IMPERIALISM by Paul M. Sweezy 1
ISRAEL IS NOT THE MAIN ENEMY by Leo Huberman 8
THE NEW POLITICS OF BLACK POWER by James Aronson 11
HAVANA: A NEW INTERNATIONAL IS BORN by John Gerassi 22
FANON REVISITED by John A. Ehrenreich 36
ON CHANGING THE WORLD: A REPLY TO
KARL MILLER by Herbert Marcuse 42
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 50
LEAVES IN THE WIND: AN INTRODUCTION by Maxwell Geismar 56

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright © 1967, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: USA: 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W.6., Telephone: Renown 8824.
Latin America: Editorial MR, Casilla 5437, Santiago, Chile.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $10; elsewhere $12.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We are now in a position to announce the most important piece of news relating to MR Press since its founding fifteen years ago: Harry Braverman has joined the Press as President and Director. For six years during the 1950's Harry was co-editor of *The American Socialist* (during this period our two magazines collaborated on a number of projects, notably *American Labor in Midpassage* which appeared first as special editions of MR and AS and later as an MR Press book). After *The American Socialist* ceased publication in 1959, Harry moved to Grove Press as a Senior Editor and remained there until July of this year, his last position having been Vice President and General Manager. In addition to many articles, he is the author of *The Future of Russia* (Macmillan, 1963; paperback in Grosset & Dunlap's Universal Library).

We have believed for some time now that MR Press has developed into the nucleus of a flourishing general publishing house of the Left; what it needed was full-time direction by a dedicated and imaginative person with a deep knowledge of the publishing business. Harry Braverman is exactly the man to fill this role, and we were delighted to find that he agrees with us about the tremendous possibilities of an expanded MR Press. We and the whole staff of MR feel privileged to be able to work with Harry Braverman in the exciting task of turning these possibilities into realities.

We are all painfully aware that the prices of MR Press cloth-bound

(*Continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT

This month, as on two previous occasions in MONTHLY REVIEW'S history (November, 1952, and October, 1961), we are publishing two signed editorials on the same subject. We naturally tried to reach agreement on a single statement and at times came close, but differences over matters of emphasis finally proved insurmountable. There are, of course, no differences over basic principles.

We had planned also to publish in this issue articles by partisans of the Israeli and Arab sides in the conflict. Owing to illness, however, one of the authors could not meet the deadline. We hope to be able to run these articles in a later issue. — The Editors

ISRAEL AND IMPERIALISM

By Paul M. Sweezy

Two years ago a war lasting many weeks took place between India and Pakistan, two of the world's most populous countries. We published nothing on the subject in MONTHLY REVIEW, editorially or otherwise; and no reader complained of the omission. Last June a war lasting a few days took place between Israel and its Arab neighbors, countries with a combined population far less than that of Pakistan alone. For compelling editorial reasons—the fact that the July-August issue had been planned long in advance, and the urgency of analyzing the summer's black uprisings in the September issue—we have up to now published nothing on the Israeli-Arab conflict. Already many readers have complained, and we are taking this first opportunity to deal with the subject. In future issues we hope to include further material which can help MR readers to understand the complicated issues involved in the struggle.

Why this difference of treatment of the Pakistani-Indian war on the one hand and the Israeli-Arab war on the other? Are we merely following the usual practice of the Western press which for understandable (if not justifiable) reasons habitually

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plays down Asian developments and highlights news from the Middle East, especially that involving Israel? The answer is definitely no. The criterion of importance which we try to apply in deciding what should and what should not go into MR derives from what we conceive to be the decisive struggle of our historical epoch, that between the industrialized metropolises of world capitalism on the one hand and the underdeveloped and exploited periphery on the other.

By this standard it did not, and still does not, seem to us that the Pakistani-Indian war was of great significance. Both countries are exploited client states of Western imperialism, and their quarrel over Kashmir, however important it may appear to them, has little bearing on their own or any other country's prospects of liberation from imperialist domination—except possibly in the sense that it weakens them both and hence increases their dependence on United States "assistance."

The Israeli-Arab conflict is very different. The Arab world taken as a whole is the field of operation *par excellence* of Western oil imperialism, the most profitable and probably the most ruthless form of capitalist imperialism. In 1965, according to official United States government figures, the income from foreign investments of United States petroleum companies was $1,789 million. Of this no less than $813 million (about 45 percent of the total) came from the predominantly Arab Middle East. Israel on the other hand has never been a source of much profit to Western capitalists, and the shoring up of its essentially artificial economy has from the beginning been very expensive indeed. Exact figures are not easy (and perhaps impossible) to come by, but in general orders of magnitude it seems likely that in recent years Israel has been receiving not less than $250 million annually in grants and loans from the Western powers, commodity aid from the United States, and contributions of (mostly wealthy) Jews to the Jewish Agency. This amounts to some $125 a year per head of the Israeli population, which is more than the total per capita income of many of the Arab countries. This inflow of wealth from abroad, plus a much higher level of technology, explain why the Israeli standard of living is several times as high as that of its neighbors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What accounts for this generosity of Western, and above all United States, imperialism to Israel? Many answers have been suggested—feelings of guilt for the West's record of anti-Semitism, the importance of the Jewish vote in the United States, historical religious and ethnic ties to the Holy Land and the people of Israel, etc.—and no doubt they all contain an element of truth. But one thing seems crysal clear to me: unless Israel followed policies and played a role in the Middle East which the imperialist powers considered to be in their own interests, the flow of loans, grants, and gifts to Israel would rapidly dry up and the Israeli economy would face crisis and probable collapse. Note that this is not to say or imply that Israel is a mere puppet of imperialism, let alone of any one imperialist power. There is much in the history of the country which would be inexplicable if this were the case. What it does mean is that on the whole and in the long run Israel and the imperialist powers see their interests as essentially parallel and often identical.

The explanation for this, I believe, is simply that imperialism and Israel, each for its own reasons, are committed to the maintenance of a weak and divided Arab world. In both cases, the basis of this commitment is clear. A strong and United Arab nation—a realistic prospect in terms of language, religion, and general historical background–would sooner or later, and probably sooner, nationalize the oil fields and use the revenue derived from the sale of oil as a basis for a real economic development program rather than as the source from which to support corrupt oligarchies and pay fabulous profits to giant foreign corporations. Such a development would be as beneficial to the Arab masses as it would be disastrous to the international oil cartel.

Israel's interest is different but no less compelling. Israel does not benefit to any significant extent from the economic exploitation of the Arab countries, but its very existence as a colonizing state rests on the expropriation of lands from the Palestinian Arabs, and in keeping with its Zionist exclusionary character it practices systematic, principled discrimination against all Arabs. Arab hostility to Israel is of the same kind and as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natural as black hostility to the white settler states in Africa. It follows quite inescapably that a strong and united Arab nation would represent a threat of infinitely greater proportions to Israel than any it has yet faced. Whether this threat would be, as Israel and its sympathizers abroad appear to believe, to the very existence of the country and its people, or whether it would be only to the discriminatory character of the Israeli state is not of crucial importance to the shaping of Israel policy. For it is clear that in either case the existing Zionist ruling establishment would rightly feel itself mortally endangered. (This does not mean that a threat to the existence of the people of Israel and a threat to the Zionist character of the Israeli state may not become of great importance. There is no doubt that the exploited Israeli lower classes, constituting a majority of the population and mostly of Asian or African origin, have an interest in remaining alive; their interest in maintaining the Zionist character of the state is at least dubious and more probably non-existent.)

If this analysis is sound, the conclusion can hardly be avoided that Israel and the imperialist powers are *de facto* allies against, not Arabs in general (the imperialists *love* Arabs who "know their place") but against the forces in the Arab world which aim to unify, strengthen, and develop the Arab nation. And it seems elementary to me that all progressives, radicals, anti-imperialists everywhere must be wholeheartedly on the side of these forces—the forces of revolutionary Arab nationalism.

What kind of struggle promises success for these forces? There is a natural tendency to assume that since imperialism is a global phenomenon with its centers of power and decision far removed from the Middle East and since Israel is a concrete reality forcibly intruded into the body of the Arab world, the correct strategy must be to concentrate the struggle at this stage against the Israeli partner in the alliance. Let all Arabs unite in a common struggle against Israel: every success will not only weaken Israel but loosen imperialism's grip on the Middle East and its natural wealth. The final accounting with imperialism can come later.

In practice this strategic conception leads to softpedalling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the class struggle within the Arab States (since all Arabs are called upon to unite against a common enemy), arming the existing Arab regimes to the maximum extent possible, and supporting a purely nationalistic political and propaganda line against Israel. Experience shows that it also leads to periodic armed clashes with Israel and inevitable defeat for the Arab armies.*

The upshot of concentrating the struggle against the local partner in the Israeli-imperialist alliance is thus the opposite of what is intended: it keeps the Arab world divided and weak, and it strengthens the grip of imperialism. It can therefore be stated with a high degree of confidence that it is precisely this strategy that both Israel and imperialism want the Arabs, and particularly revolutionary Arabs, to follow.

There are now, following the military debacle of last June, encouraging signs that Arab revolutionaries have learned this lesson and have begun the process of reappraising the past and mapping new courses for the future. Given the woeful inadequacy of the Western press in matters of this kind and my own lack of access to Arab sources, I am unable to do more than record certain impressions based on fragmentary reports (especially in the French press) and on conversations with individuals in closer touch with developments in the Arab world.

At the heart of what appears to be an emerging new Arab revolutionary line lies recognition of the definitive failure of, and hence the necessity to abandon, the attempt to defeat Israel by means of conventional warfare waged by a coalition of existing Arab states. And a corollary of this recognition is a shifting to an espousal of people's war as the main form of struggle in the future. (In this connection it should be remembered that people's war is no foreign import or recent innovation in the Middle East and North Africa. Westerners are familiar with it through the exploits of Lawrence of Arabia in the struggles against Turkish domination; the Israelis made their contribution

* The reason for these defeats is to be found in the existence of a high positive correlation between the technological and educational level of a country on the one hand and its ability to master the weapons and methods of modern conventional warfare on the other.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in fighting British rule in Palestine after the Second World War; guerrilla harassment played a leading part in driving the British out of Suez; the Algerians fought a seven-year epic to final triumph over French colonialism; and most recently the popular struggle against British rule in Aden and South Arabia appears to be on the verge of victory. For those who put their faith in people's war there is certainly no lack of historical experience or heroic example.)

But conventional war and people's war are not simply substitutes for each other. They are totally different phenomena, waged by different kinds of combatant forces, and having different political and socio-economic implications and consequences. Perhaps the most important difference is that conventional armed forces can move out of their base areas and wage war at a distance, while guerrillas, whether urban or rural, can fight effectively only on their home ground where they enjoy the support of the masses. The adoption of the strategy of people's war against Israel therefore means that only a small proportion of the Arab population can be directly involved, those who are living in areas occupied by Israel or at any rate very close to the Israeli borders. The rest can be only indirectly and obviously not very effectively involved. This is true, however, only if the struggle against Israel is conceived in the old way, in nationalistic terms. As soon as it is recognized that the real enemy of the Arab revolution is not only, or even mainly, Israel but imperialism in tacit alliance with Israel, then the whole perspective is transformed. It then becomes both possible and necessary to envisage the spread of people's war to the whole area of imperialist domination. All partners to the alliance against the Arab revolution would then be brought under more or less simultaneous attack, including of course the Arab oligarchies which, like their counterparts in the rest of the Third World are the local agents, executors, and executioners of imperialism.

As far as Israel is concerned, it has obviously made itself far more vulnerable to this kind of struggle, by conquering and occupying large additional chunks of Arab territory in the June war. In the Arab countries people's war can doubtless be most rapidly developed in the backward kingdoms and sheikdoms

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the oil is concentrated. Whether the more progressive Arab countries (Egypt, Syria, and Algeria) will also be theaters of people's war will probably depend on the evolution of their regimes as the struggle spreads and intensifies. If they really support the revolution in deeds as well as in words, and move internally in a leftward direction, they may play a highly important positive role in the overall struggle against imperialism.

Experience around the world—especially in Vietnam, the Congo, and the Dominican Republic—indicates that wherever revolutionary people's war shows signs of succeeding, direct imperialist intervention can be expected. Israel will then have to decide whether to join its imperialist partners in renewed wars of intervention against the Arab states. If it does, it will finally and definitively cast in its lot with imperialism and will share the same ultimate fate.

There is some hope, however, that the course of events in Israel may be different. The replacement of nationalist forms of struggle by revolutionary forms of struggle in the Arab world can hardly help having an effect on the Arab political and propaganda line toward Israel. Faced with an increasingly bitter struggle against imperialism, the Arab revolutionaries may well adopt a line toward Israel designed not to unite but to divide Israelis. This would mean abandoning (largely empty) threats to annihilate Israel and appealing for revolutionary solidarity to the Israeli proletariat which, as noted above, is made up mostly of Jews from Asia and Africa who, in terms of language and general cultural background, often have more in common with Arabs than with the Jews of European and American origin who control the country. As of now such appeals would probably meet with little response. But as the struggle develops and the contradictions of Israeli society become ever deeper and more insoluble within the present national and international framework, the situation may change. At any rate it seems the best hope for Israelis who understand that the route their country is now traveling—essentially the same route being traveled by the imperialist powers with which Israel is in tacit alliance—is in the long run a one-way street to disaster.

Reporting on his latest interview with Mao Tse-tung in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic of February 27, 1965, Edgar Snow wrote: "During our conversation he repeatedly thanked foreign invaders for speeding up the Chinese revolution and for bestowing similar favors in Southeast Asia today." If the Arab revolution is now being speeded up, as seems highly probable, do not the Arab revolutionaries owe a similar vote of thanks to the Israelis? Will Arab leaders emerge with the historic vision to see it and the philosophic temperament to say it? One hopes so, for the world sorely needs more such revolutionary leaders.

ISRAEL IS NOT THE MAIN ENEMY

By Leo Huberman

Let me begin with the fact that the Arabs have a just case against the Israelis on many counts, and that Israel has been, indeed, an outpost of imperialism. Grant this, as a truly impartial observer must, and then ask yourself the question: suppose the Arab armies had accomplished their aim, had, in fact, "annihilated" Israel—would the masses of people in the Arab countries be any better off? The answer is "no."

Now ask yourself this question: suppose the Arab revolutionaries were to succeed in overthrowing their feudal monarchs, in establishing socialism, and in recapturing, through expropriation of the oil companies, the enormous wealth now stolen from them; would the masses of people in the Arab countries be any better off? Obviously, the answer is "yes."

The answers to these questions are crucial to an understanding of the root of the Arab-Israeli problem since they so clearly point the way to the main enemy of the Arab masses: not Israel, but their own feudal, reactionary, bureaucratic governments which exploit them, and Western imperialism which robs them of their wealth. Indeed, a good case can be made for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the argument that the state of Israel was planted on Arab land, in the first instance, by the imperialist nations in league with the Arab feudal monarchs precisely for the purpose of keeping themselves in power by providing a substitute for the main enemy.

And the Arab revolutionaries have fallen into the trap. They have concentrated their energies on abolishing Israel instead of on abolishing imperialism. It is true that Israel frequently votes with the imperialist nations in the UN, it was on the imperialist side in South Korea, in the Algerian revolution, in the 1956 invasion of Egypt, and currently in South Vietnam—it is, in short, a lackey of imperialism. But to go after the lackey and not the master is to fall for an old ruling-class trick which benefits only the master. Arab socialists should turn their sights on the real target—if they are to be part of a "holy war" they should direct that war against enemy No. 1 which is not Israel but feudalism and imperialism.

And, if they would remember that socialism is an international not a nationalist movement, and if they could overcome the feeling of hatred for Israelis, they would find, on the other side of the border, allies in their struggle. There are in Israel, and there have been since the state was founded, a small number of Israelis who are left revolutionaries, socialists who have always opposed their government's anti-Arab policies, who have fought for justice for the refugees and against second-class citizenship for Palestinian Arabs, who recognize that the current Israeli "victory," like the others before it, will not bring peace. There are socialists who have always struggled against capitalism in Israel, against its pro-imperialist policies, for a bi-national state. Arab revolutionaries and Israeli revolutionaries must join in a common effort to rid themselves of the exploiters in both camps and introduce socialism in both Israel and the Arab countries.

When an exploited people takes up arms against its ruling class, when it joins the world-wide struggle against imperialism, true socialists rejoice and support the revolutionaries to the best of their ability. Thus when Nasser threw out the imperialists in control of the Suez Canal, when he introduced some urgently necessary progressive measures, he deserved and received the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backing of socialists. But let there be no mistake about it—Nasser is not a Fidel Castro and his Egypt is not a Middle Eastern Cuba; nor is Syria, in spite of the socialist proclamations of its Left party. As for the other Arab nations which joined the war of annihilation against Israel, they are not anti- but pro-imperialist.

So, too, is Israel. And unless she changes her pro-imperialist, anti-Arab policy to one in which the rights of the Arabs are re-established and Israel is integrated into the Arab Middle East, then peace and security will not be attained. The "victory" just won and other such victories to come do not solve the conflict—they exacerbate it. And they may thus speed the day when the country which was to be a haven for dispossessed Jews becomes, instead, their grave.

It may very well be that my own views on the Arab-Israeli conflict are influenced by the fact that I am a Jew. But I am a socialist, too, and while I can find much in socialist doctrine that endorses the destruction of imperialism, I can find nothing in socialist doctrine that calls for the liquidation of a state and the annihilation of its people. The United States is unquestionably the most powerful, most ruthless, most exploitative imperialism in the world today. It is the responsibility, the duty, of every revolutionary socialist to do what he can to destroy that imperialism. But as a socialist, I would consider the annihilation of the American *people* a crime against humanity, and it is as a *socialist* and for the same reason, that I am opposed to the destruction of Israel and its people.

In a recent interview with K. S. Karol (*New Statesman*, September 22, 1967), Fidel Castro said that he "had been shocked, in the period leading up to the war, by Arab propaganda of a kind that revealed the lack of revolutionary principles." He added: "True revolutionaries never threaten a whole country with extermination. . . . We have spoken out clearly against Israel's policy, but we don't deny her right to exist."

I agree.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW POLITICS OF BLACK POWER

BY JAMES ARONSON

The most significant gathering of American radicals in a generation took place over the long Labor Day weekend (actually August 29 to September 4) in Chicago under the auspices of the National Conference for New Politics. Ostensibly the convention, to which more than 350 local and regional peace, civil rights, political, and civil liberties groups sent representatives, was called to chart a course for independent electoral politics in 1968 and for community organization as a prelude to independent political action. In fact it accomplished neither of these purposes.

Its significance lay in the fact that it became the first real, sustained, no-holds-barred confrontation between the black community and white radicals and liberals. It was, in a most positive sense, the application of the concept of black power. The immediate result, in this observer's view, was equally positive in that it helped to fashion a framework—a realistic framework—for the first steps toward the goal of a radical movement in America.

In essence, the confrontation was both political and psychological. The black community was declaring its freedom from white control—reactionary to radical. It was saying to the most concerned and committed representatives of white America: We are testing you. We are asking finally that you accept us as equals. In the crisis situation we are in, any talk of minority vs. majority is useless and irrelevant. We must be accepted not only as equals but as equals who will determine the role we have to play and direct the people and the organizations who will carry out that role. We have no desire to extend our control over white groups.

James Aronson, a founder and for many years editor of the *National Guardian*, is a veteran New York newspaperman. He is at present working on a book on the United States press and the Cold War.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was saying further: We are in motion. We are already doing what we have to do. Talk of coalition between black and white now is neither possible nor material. You cannot join with us in the old way. There is no longer a director's chair or a protective sanctuary for white people in the black community. Togetherness in the long marches in the South and the hand-linked singing of "We Shall Overcome" in the churches of the North are remembrances of things past. Do not any longer come to us and tell us what dreadful people you come from. We know that; we have known it for generations. Since you now know it, stay in your own communities and work to change the dreadfulness of your white neighbors and associates. If you suffer in the effort—and you will—you may finally come to know what we have been enduring these many generations, and why we will no longer endure it.

For the white radicals who came to Chicago, fully believing that they stood solidly with the black freedom movement, the confrontation with the extent of black anger, resentment, and bitterness was first a shock, then a revelation. It was a most insensitive white being who left Chicago unshaken to the bottom of his soul by this confrontation. For many, the public catharsis was deeply personal and private, despite the seeming contradiction. If the change persists—and herein lies the basic significance of Labor Day, 1967, in Chicago—it may well have opened the way to genuine revolutionary action in America.

In Chicago, the black representatives—about 600 of 2,000 delegates—formed themselves into a black caucus and met separately in what they termed a "Black Convention." There was for days almost no mingling with white persons. There was no camaraderie in the corridors and the meeting rooms of the solidly sedate Palmer House, no laughter, no fun. The air bristled with tension as it became clearer by the hour that a showdown on relations between black and white was inevitable. The earnest planners of the convention, equipped with manifestoes, workshop schedules, and position papers neatly printed in professional looking convention newspapers, were clearly not prepared for what was developing. In a sense this was fortunate because it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attested to the genuine spontaneity of what happened subsequently.

The convocation meeting in the barn-like Coliseum on South Wabash Avenue was uninspiring. Interspersed with desultory country music and folk-rock entertainment, the speeches were for the most part cliché-ridden and remarkably un-new politics. Dick Gregory (true comedians are very serious people) provided the only real fire with a machine-gun denunciation of white society which, to the latter-day amazement of some people, includes Jews. He provided new fodder for the Negro-Jewish controversy by saying: "Every Jew in America over 30 knows another Jew that hates Negroes; and if we hate Jews, that's even, baby."

The keynote speech by the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. on the night of August 31 was something of an anti-climax, since he had announced earlier in the week that he would not be available as a candidate for the Presidency on an independent ticket. But the content of the speech was even more of an anti-climax. It was platitudinous and unpolitical. It even had, in the advance text, one of those reversible familiar quotations from the late President Kennedy: "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." Some hovering angel had the celestial insight to strike the passage from the delivered text. Having spoken his piece, Dr. King departed the Coliseum and, evidently, Chicago; for he was reported in the press, at the climax of the Chicago convention, to be addressing a liberal audience on Fire Island, off the coast of New York, a lily-white haven of affluent intellectuals.

By contrast, Dr. Benjamin Spock, baby doctor to the nation, who has been spoken of as a Vice Presidential candidate with King, arrived in Chicago August 31 and remained through September 4. He became a familiar figure, sitting quietly, his wife at his side, at plenary sessions, taking part in committee meetings, and providing a far more meaningful keynote address September 1. Its note of militancy testified to his understanding and commitment, not only on the question of peace but of black freedom as well. He said:

The disadvantages which black people suffer in health, edu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation, job competence, employment, have been imposed by the white community through 300 years of abuse and humiliation. The founding fathers declared that people who are oppressed and can find no other redress must rebel. Abraham Lincoln specifically reiterated that right. Black people have long taken oppression ten times as cruel as what the colonists suffered in the 18th century. Whites have practiced a thousand acts of physical and psychological violence on blacks for every act of black violence. Pompous officials and editors should be directing their indignation not at a few dozen justifiably angry blacks but at the white churches, schools, industries, police departments, stores, real estate boards, residential communities which have refused to treat blacks with elementary decency. . . .

Having thus presented his convictions, Dr. Spock may perhaps have been better equipped than many other white delegates for the events that followed. The next day the black caucus issued what was regarded by many white delegates as an ultimatum. To this observer it was, rather, an ultimate test. It was a 13-point statement which the black caucus insisted be adopted without revision. In its preamble it said:

> We, as black people, believe that a United States system that is committed to the practice of genocide, social degradation, the denial of political and cultural determination of black people, cannot reform itself: There must be revolutionary change. Revolutionary change does not mean systematic exclusion of blacks from the decision-making process as was done here in this convention. This exclusion raises serious doubts that white people are serious about revolutionary change.

The statement asked for the regrouping of all committees, giving 50 percent representation to black people, and a change in the conference slogan from "Peace and Freedom" to "Freedom and Peace." It asked support for the concept of self-determination of black people in the United States and for national liberation movements throughout the world; for the re-seating of Representative Adam Clayton Powell (D-N.Y.) and assistance to local organizations in voter registration and electoral campaigns for black candidates; support for all resolutions issuing from the recent National Conference on Black Power in Newark; and for a bill introduced by Representative John

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conyers (D-Mich.) to rebuild Detroit's black communities destroyed in the uprising there.

The two most controversial points were (1) a condemnation of the "imperialistic Zionist war" with a specific proviso that "this condemnation does not imply anti-semitism"; (2) a "suggestion" for the establishment of "white civilizing committees in white communities to civilize and humanize the savage and beast-like character that runs rampant throughout America, as exemplified by George Lincoln Rockwells and Lyndon Baines Johnsons."

For those who insisted that Israel had fought a war of self-preservation, it could be noted that there were radicals in Israel—in a divided Communist Party particularly—who vigorously condemned their own government's action and sought unity with radicals in the Arab countries in a common fight to replace both the capitalist government of Israel and the feudal rules of the Arabian oil baronies.

For those who felt that it was in poor taste to link Lyndon Johnson with the assassinated leader of the American Nazi Party, a simple question could be asked: "How many kids —American and Vietnamese—did Rockwell kill during his aborted career?"

By this time the convention knew that the issue had been joined, that there could be no hope for any meaningful political organizing anywhere until the working relationship between black and white had been resolved. In its parts, the black caucus statement had no great significance, although some were regarded by many white delegates as unnecessarily provocative. As a whole, the document had tremendous significance.

In the context of the convention, and given the mood of the black delegates, a breakdown of the statement for a debate on its individual parts was as meaningless for the black delegates as was the practical application of parliamentary democracy in their life at large. Increasingly, the white delegates began to understand the nature of the challenge. Little groups of "ad hoc committees" sprang up, and mimeographed statements descended on the delegates like fluttering snow flakes. One read:

Let's not continue to bitch about a word here or there—that's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

really "old politics." The [black] resolution calls for more than rhetoric from us. It calls for community organizing by white radicals among white constituencies to develop a base for radical action. Black people are already on the move. They are able to move because they have a base. White people do not now have a base and that's where it's at. The black liberation movement is a fact. Whites are standing by in fear passing on statements which do not begin to solve anything. . . . Don't try to change the specifics of the resolution. That's completely missing the point. Vote the spirit of it.

This is precisely what the convention did. The black caucus statement was approved by a vote of 3-to-1. The debate was spirited and often acrimonious, but took place entirely among white delegates. The black delegates did not speak, except to make clear that their statement had to be accepted without change. Their attitude remained aloof and hostile. The emotions among the white delegates were mixed. The process of learning had begun, but it was mingled with confusion as to whether they had done the right thing. The ad hoc groups were right: old politics dies hard. The white delegates knew they were giving up something—had to give up something—but they did not know whether what they were giving up was good or bad. In fact, what they were giving up was white supremacy.

In this charged atmosphere the plenary session on black power was convened on the Sunday before Labor Day. The black delegates came into the hall in a body and sat separately in front of the rostrum in an area roped off incongruously in red velvet. There were men and women from the ghettos of New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and Los Angeles; representatives of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and political groups from Georgia, Virginia, and Alabama; elderly veterans of the civil rights struggles of the last 50 years; young women in African dress and young men in African tunics. They sat quietly together, their feelings visible mainly in their eyes. They were disciplined and determined—and yet (as they conceded later) not quite sure how things would turn out.

Carlos Russell of Brooklyn, the elected caucus chairman,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presided over the plenary. He announced that H. Rap Brown, who had been expected to address the session, would speak instead to an all-black session later that afternoon, and that the speaker at the plenary would be James Forman, international affairs director of SNCC. The press reported that Brown had refused to speak to a white audience; the fact was that the black caucus had made the decision for Forman to speak.

But before Forman spoke, a young Negro Army private, Ronald Lockman, in summer uniform, was introduced to announce that he was due to report the next week at San Francisco for shipment to Vietnam. He said he would not report. The audience rose in ovation–for the first time black and white together—and shouted in unison, over and over: "Hell, no; we won't go." For those who were complaining that Vietnam had gone lost in the struggle over black power, it was a dramatic joining of the issues. Again, it was the black caucus which had taken the initiative. In mid-September, Lockman made good his vow. He was arrested and faces 11 years at hard labor.

Forman's speech was a thoroughgoing and able presentation of the aspirations of the African liberation movement. It was in essence a report on SNCC's participation in a United Nations-sponsored conference in Zambia almost entirely ignored in the United States press. Forman stressed the indivisibility of the black freedom movement in America with that of Africa and the world. It was in effect a reply to those who asked whether the black people of America wanted to "go it alone," without white allies. We are not alone, Forman said: we are with the people of the world, colored and white, who are struggling to be free.

Then he went on to give a devastating description of the betrayal of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party at the Atlantic City convention of the Democratic Party in 1964, exposing the double-dealing of the white liberals. He warned against being "tricked again by the labor-liberal coalition." He insisted that the black people would have to unite in an independent black political movement against the power of the Democratic Party. He said that the urban black vote could be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decisive in a Presidential election, but made no overture to the Republicans. Of the black people, he said:

> We and we alone have the responsibility to wage our own war of liberation as we see it. No one, absolutely no one in the United States has the right to dictate to us our forms of struggle. We insist on our right to define the manner in which we will fight our aggressors, and anyone who does not like it can go to hell. The dispossessed must assume direction and give leadership to the new politics.

Following the Forman speech, a motion was introduced, based on a credentials committee recommendation, by a white delegate, to give the black caucus 50 percent of the votes of the plenary sessions of the convention. This went even beyond the demand of the 13-point statement which had asked for 50 percent voting power in all committees. Again a vigorous debate ensued and again the black delegates maintained silence—this time complete. At one point a black delegate moved to a microphone on the floor to speak. Three black delegates separated themselves from their caucus seats, approached the would-be speaker, and spoke to him quietly. He withdrew. "Strong-arm stuff," said some of the reporters at the press tables. But not a hand had been laid, and it was obviously in keeping with the resolution of the black caucus to permit the whites to work out their own response to the black challenge.

The tension was so high that some of the correspondents covering the convention lost their public impartiality and openly applauded speakers who rose against the equal-vote resolution. Particularly vocal were Dwight Macdonald, a veteran of the intellectual wars of the last several decades, who writes a column for *Esquire*; and a nervous gum-chewing young woman from the *New Yorker* who wore her coat throughout as though prepared for a quick getaway in the event that the black panther descended. When a Young Communist delegate rose to speak vigorously for the resolution, Macdonald slumped into his seat. "My God," he said, "I thought they were the conservatives."

Frequently heard in the debate were such phrases as "blackmail" and "racism in reverse" and "massive guilt com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plex." One young delegate said, in a tortured explanation, that he opposed the motion because he truly wanted equality for the black people; that to vote for the motion would be to "bend over backwards" and make a mockery of equality. A young woman said: "I'm voting against this—but I hope it passes."

Then came the vote. The motion carried by better than 2 to 1. To say that pandemonium reigned would be an inadequate straining of a cliché. The hall came alive. Black and white delegates rose to cheer and pound one another on the back. The velvet ropes came down—and the atmosphere changed in a split second. Carlos Russell, the black caucus chairman, went to the rostrum. In a choked voice he said that the battle had shown the nation that "black people can fight." "Now," he said, "we can proceed to the business of new politics as designed." The black silence, he confirmed, had been "a test of the sincerity of the white folk." He thanked all who had "stood with us" and said: "Now we are ready to go to work."

They were. In the business that followed, the black delegates participated fully. They withdrew a motion to adjourn to the following morning (it was then midnight) and agreed instead to a post-midnight session on the question of an independent Presidential ticket and the matter of organizing in the communities. They discarded a plan to press for withdrawal of a compromise agreement, reached the night before without their participation, to set up an independent Presidential ticket on a state-to-state basis, and to further the work of community organizations. They agreed to full participation, on an equal basis, in the work of the continuations committees. They also agreed to a modified resolution on the Middle East which accepted the "reality" of Israel.

At the close of the conference it seemed as though the work of new politics had not even got under way. In fact it had. The entire debate on the question of black power had been new politics, harsh at times, acrimonious and uncomfortable, but real, as all beginnings of revolutionary activity must be. It was exhilarating, but it had none of the euphoria of the Progressive Party convention of 1948. It was a different time. It was clear

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to black and white alike that only a beginning had been made (and many white delegates doubted even that); but if the black caucus position had been rejected by the white radical majority, it would have amounted to a rejection of all hope of new politics at this time. Now at least there was a chance. Nothing more than that.

The clearest demonstration of the positive quality of the convention was offered in the negative reports and comments in the press and on television. The headlines in Chicago read: "Racism in the New Left" (Chicago's *American,* September 1) and "Blacks Win New Politics Control" (*Sun-Times,* September 4). On NBC-TV Sander Vanocur determined that "not one intellectual of standing" had been present at the convention.

In New York it was recorded that "submissive whites" (James Wechsler in the *Post*, September 6) had reversed the "master-slave approach." The *Times* said editorially (September 4) of the white delegates: "Morally, these concessions are inexcusable because they are insincere. . . . These surrenders to racist and extremist Negro blackmail discredit the organizations involved." There has never been a hint that the *Times* would credit such organizations, with or without black power. Max Lerner, the syndicated columnist who vies with his stablemate Dr. Rose Franzblau in Instant Analysis, had this diagnosis, September 8: "Surrender by white self-hatred and masochism. . . . The end of the radical left in any meaningful sense at least in this decade."

This kind of massive misreading of the Negro mind and mood—through deliberation or ignorance—reinforces the black distrust and despair over the white mind. It underscores for black America that the white power structure, out of fear and greed, will never yield control over black America without a fierce struggle. The militant black leadership has accepted the challenge with a revolutionary response. The challenge they put to the white radicals was this: Do you stand with the white power structure or with the oppressed black people?

The white radicals, for the most part, passed the first test in Chicago. But it remains to be seen whether they will follow this resolve with action. It may well be, as Fidel Castro has said,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that some people can take just so much revolution, and then drop away. There will be dropouts as a result of Chicago. But there will be many more who will stay—and there will be recruits.

"Learn, baby, learn," said one leaflet (white) in Chicago. Baby, we learned, the hard way.

What is this, the sound and rumour? What is this that all men hear,
Like the wind in hollow valleys when the storm is drawing near,
Like the rolling on of ocean in the eventide of fear?
'Tis the people marching on.
Hark the rolling of the thunder!
Lo the sun! and lo thereunder
Riseth wrath, and hope, and wonder,
And the host comes marching on.

—*William Morris*

I am not opposed to all war, nor am I opposed to fighting under all circumstances, and any declaration to the contrary would disqualify me as a revolutionist. When I say I am opposed to war, I mean ruling-class war, for the ruling class is the only class that makes war. . . .

But while I have not a drop of blood to shed for the oppressors of the working class and the robbers of the poor, the thieves and looters, the brigands and murderers whose debauched misrule is the crime of the ages, I have a heartful to shed for their victims when it shall be needed in the war for their liberation.

I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class, but I will not wait to be commanded to fight for the working class.

I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution.

—*Eugene Debs, Appeal to Reason, September 11, 1915*

Sometimes the poor are praised for being thrifty. But to recommend thrift to the poor is both grotesque and insulting. It is like advising a man who is starving to eat less.

—*Oscar Wilde, The Soul of Man under Socialism*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAVANA: A NEW INTERNATIONAL IS BORN

BY JOHN GERASSI

To most American reporters present, what was fascinating about the Organization of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS) conference, which took place in Havana during the first ten days of August, were its various sideshows. Some were disturbing, as when Stokely Carmichael, the main attraction besides Fidel himself, quipped that "America is going to fall and I only hope to live long enough to see it." Some were curious, as when leaders of Latin American Communist Parties huddled in corners of the Havana Libre (ex-Hilton) hotel's spacious, marble-floored corridors ironing out a common strategy like conspirators in an old-time Preminger movie. And some were enchanting as when the huge triple-decked outdoor stage of the plush Tropicana night club suddenly came alive with multicolored waterfalls and luscious mulatto girls as naked as Latin Quarter Chorus cuties. But what was truly dramatic during OLAS went almost unnoticed: the birth of a new International.

In lauching the new, Fifth International, Fidel was risking a great deal—and he knew it. On the one hand, he could expect the United States dominated Organization of American States (OAS) to find in it justification for an armed assault on Cuba. On the other, he could conceive that Russia's anger might be transformed into material retaliation, which would deprive Cuba of the oil it needs to keep running and the raw materials it requires to develop. Indeed, many Cubans were already talking of a "double blockade," and only partly in jest. But to be true to himself and to the Cuban Revolution, Fidel had to do what he did—and most Cubans, fully aware of the possible consequences, jubilantly and enthusiastically approved.

A veteran Latin American correspondent, the author of *The Great Fear In Latin America,* John Gerassi is currently teaching international relations at San Francisco State College.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In essence, the new International was simply the systematization and continentalization of Cuba's own Revolution —armed struggle through guerrilla forces which gradually gain the support of the peasant masses. As such, OLAS's task was to spell out the economic, political, cultural, and military reasons why armed struggle is necessary and to establish the machinery by which guerrillas in any one country of Latin America can count on the active support of those in any other. Thus, OLAS would have to reject officially Russia's "peaceful co-existence" policy; more, it would have to explain why such a policy necessarily leads to a betrayal of the poor and the exploited peoples of the Americas. Finally, OLAS would have to commit itself, more or less openly, to an outright interventionist position.

It is true, and perhaps Fidel was banking on it, that Russia could not afford, propagandistically, to punish Cuba for its revolutionary fervor, especially when most radicals and left-wingers already criticize Russia's lukewarm support of Vietnam. Indeed, during OLAS, one revolutionary, Comandante Francisco Prada, third in command of Venezuela's FALN (Armed Forces of National Liberation), publicly lamented the fact that Vietnam was "tragically alone."

Besides, Cubans have been silently convinced ever since the 1962 missile crisis that Russia was capable of abandoning them in a showdown with the United States. They might have harbored a false sense of security after Kennedy was reported to have made his no-invasion promise.

But Vietnam changed all that. With America's increasing aggressiveness in that hapless country the Cuban leaders realized that Kennedy's promise was not worth very much—in fact, the State Department has since denied that there was such a promise. Thus they are certain that once the United States settles the Vietnam war one way or another, it will go after Cuba. On August 10th, at the close of OLAS, Fidel explicitly stated that this was his conviction. He read a *Daily News* editorial which said (in re-translation), "Let's stick a memo in Uncle Sam's hat to trample Castro under foot with all necessary force to destroy his Communist regime, as soon as we win the war in Vietnam."

Though he scoffed that "If the danger posed to this coun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try depends on a United States victory in Vietnam, we will all die of old age," Fidel made it clear that it was in Cuba's national interest, as well as in the interest of all revolutionaries in the small countries of the underdeveloped world, to create as many Vietnams as possible.

Sometime in 1965, Che Guevara, who had long thought this to be the case, disappeared from Cuba to help organize the revolutionary movements of Latin America. To do so, he needed a fresh approach and a fresher commitment. The Communist Parties of Latin America by and large accept Russia's co-existence policy. Like Russia, they claim that by playing the game of legality, entering elections, organizing the working class, etc., they will eventually be brought to power without bloodshed.

Che disagreed. He realized that the United States and its oligarchic partners in Latin America occasionally tolerated Communist legality only because it was ineffective and unproductive. Che knew that in every country of Latin America the "national bourgeoisie," which Karl Marx once expected would lead the first revolutionary assault on imperialism, was completely tied materially to American corporate interests. Furthermore, Che, who never underestimated his enemy, saw that American imperialism was not static but dynamic, that it could generate enough mobility within the cities to create a sense of progress in the urban masses strong enough to neutralize the traditional proletariat as a revolutionary force. Instead, said Che, it had to be the peasants who would make up the revolutionary force, and it is with them that the revolutionary vanguard must work. And since the peasants were neither organized nor controlled by the Communist Parties, these Parties could not be considered a revolutionary vanguard. The young French philosopher, Régis Debray, picking up these thoughts and adding them to Che's book on *Guerrilla Warfare,* then constructed the basis for a new concept of revolution through the building up of small guerrilla bands in remote areas, where peasants are totally outside society and where advanced military technology loses its advantage. The role of the traditional Communist Party in these operations was discounted.

Naturally, Communist leaders were not very enthusiastic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over these developments. At a meeting in Prague last May, they denounced the forthcoming OLAS meeting as divisionistic, and supported the Venezuelan Communist Party which had already been denounced by Fidel himself.

The Venezuelan case is the key to understanding the whole new process of revolution in the Americas. Back in 1961 it was mainly the Communists—the traditional, Moscow-line party, with relative strength in the cities—that launched the country's first armed struggle through the creation of the FALN. The orders, the money, the arms, and the food came from the city as the Party continued to lead the armed operations from its central committee headquarters. For a while, as the result of armed uprisings by leftists and Communists within the armed forces, it looked as if the armed struggle was rapidly gaining strength. But, as Presidents Betancourt and then Leoni came down hard on the Party, jailing the leaders and declaring their activities illegal, the FALN suffered greatly. It was then that the CP decided to abandon the armed struggle and return to legality. It ordered its field commanders to give themselves up.

Douglas Bravo, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party and commander-in-chief of the FALN, refused. He was trounced out of the Party and was denounced as an adventurer. His men were then cut off from funds and material and, it is said, were even betrayed. "The right wing leadership of the Communist Party behaved like a spurned mistress —denouncing, lying, trying its best to isolate its former lover," Comandante Ellias Manuit, one of Venezuela's chief guerrilla fighters who was also kicked out of the CP, told me recently. To Manuit, Bravo, Prada, and the other fighters, this was an outright betrayal. Fidel thought so too. He said: "Maybe some day the Venezuelan people will ask them [the Communist leaders] about the millions of dollars they collected throughout the world on behalf of the guerrilla movement which they abandoned; whose members they left without shoes, clothes, food, and even the bare necessities; and which they have accused and attacked without scruples of any kind." And Prada, who was chairman of the Venezuelan delegation to OLAS, told me, "For the sake of their own legal standing, they have abandoned every one of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their principles, betrayed their comrades, and are in effect now in partnership with the repressive forces against the people."

What it all comes down to is this: If you are a revolutionary, you must fight; if you do not fight, you are not a revolutionary. And that was OLAS's motto, derived from the Second Declaration of Havana: "The duty of every revolutionary is to make the revolution."

But it is a dangerous concept, especially for Russia which wants to avoid a confrontation with the United States at all costs. And the Cubans have no illusions about what to expect. In a crucial and brilliant speech, Raúl Castro on July 22nd told a graduating class of the Superior School of the Ministry of Armed Forces: "Our country is very small and very narrow and behind us is the sea so that we have no space to retreat. We must be ready. It is the price that we must pay to maintain our revolution and we may have to maintain it with our own resources alone." And to the rumor propagated by Humphrey in Alaska that Kosygin had come to Cuba at the suggestion of Johnson in order to tell Cuba to cool it, Raúl said that Cuba used to have two "Papas": first, Spain; then, the United States. Now: "We have no Papas! . . . Do we have [Russia's]help? Yes, we have. Is it good? Yes, it is good. Can we depend exclusively on it? No."

In Santiago on July 26th Fidel repeated the admonition to an excited but jubilant crowd of half a million people, most of them peasants who had come from all over the country. Flanked by members of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party (who are all revolutionaries now) and by the guest of honor, Stokely Carmichael, Fidel Castro shouted:

> It is necessary that all Cubans, all of us, be clear about certain things. We are not going to speak of the correlation of forces between imperialism and ourselves; we are not going to speak of how many planes they can send over our heads, or how many soldiers they can send. We are not going to speak of foreign help. We must say realistically that we are thousands of miles from any country that can give us any kind of help and, in case of an invasion here, we must learn to accustom ourselves to the idea that we are going to fight alone . . . and there is one word that is absolutely forbidden in revolutionary terminology—defeat; and equal-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly the synonym of defeat—surrender. And, in addition, there is a phrase that as a matter of profound principle will be forever abolished from the terminology of this revolution and that phrase is "Cease Fire."

Four days later, in the swank ballrooms and former casino rooms of the Havana Libre, OLAS got under way in earnest. The general sessions were public, and it was there that Stokely Carmichael made his dramatic entry into the revolutionary process of the underdeveloped world. I had been with Stokely at the Dialectics of Liberation Congress in London earlier in the month, and I had heard him repeatedly refer to the black rebellions as the prelude to revolutionary warfare in the United States. I had also heard him there refer to the Negro ghettos as the underdeveloped, imperialized portions of the United States. But now, on the podium, flanked by Rodney Arismendi, the biggest name in Latin American Communism, by three genuine fighters from Latin America, including Comandante Prada of the Venezuelan FALN and Comandante Néstor Valle of the Guatemalan FAR (Armed Revolutionary Forces), and by Haydée Santamaría, one of the two women survivors of Fidel's 1953 assault on the Moncada barracks, facing some of the most courageous and dedicated revolutionaries of the continent, Stokely said:

We greet you as comrades because it becomes increasingly clear to us each day that we share with you a common struggle; we have a common enemy. Our enemy is white Western imperialist society; our struggle is to overthrow the system which feeds itself and expands itself through the economic and cultural exploitation of non-white, non-Western peoples. We speak with you, comrades, because we wish to make clear that we understand that our destinies are intertwined. We do not view our struggle as being contained within the boundaries of the United States, as they are defined by present-day maps. . . . When black people in Africa begin to storm Johannesburg, when Latin Americans revolt, what will be the role of the United States and that of African Americans? It seems inevitable that this nation will move to protect its financial interests in South Africa and Latin America, which means protecting white rule in these countries. Black people in the United States then have the responsibility to oppose, at least to neutralize, that effort by the United States. . . . [Together our task is] starting a new history of man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The real work, however, was carried out in the Commission sessions from which both observers and press were banned. During these sessions, which lasted a week, the clash between the *fidelistas* and the *ortodoxos* gained momentum. In crucial Commission I, which was to decide the ideological and political definition of a permanent OLAS, Arismendi, who is Secretary-General of the Uruguayan Communist party, and John William Cooke, a Communist-hating ex-Peronist who was chairman of the Argentine delegation, exchanged such fiery insults that the session had to be postponed lest it degenerate into blows. At another time, when the Venezuelans referred to Communists as counter-revolutionaries, Arismendi threatened to walk out for good.

As the revolutionary hard-line prevailed more and more, the clash between the two sides became hotter and hotter. Ideologically, it was a fundamental clash, for from it may come about not only the split but also, if the revolutionaries can successfully repeat the Bolivian operation elsewhere in the Americas in the next year or two, the demise of the Communist Party structure on the continent. The traditional Communists were best represented by Manuel Cepeda, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of Colombia, while the *fidelistas* were supported most vehemently by Prada and President Dorticós himself. Rodney Arismendi agilely tried to develop an intermediary position, recognizing, on the one hand, that armed struggle is the highest form of revolutionary activity but that it is not the exclusive one, and, on the other, that all Communist Parties do belong to the revolutionary vanguard even if they no longer necessarily dominate it. This was quite a compromise, since traditional Communists have never before allowed their monopoly of the vanguard to be challenged. Also, Arismendi's compromise tacitly recognized that in the struggle between FALN and the Communist Party of Venezuela, FALN predominates. But the compromise failed.

Taking the following quotes out of actual speeches made by Cepeda, Prada, Arismendi, and Dorticós, the debate could have sounded thus:

Question: What is the object of OLAS?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dorticós: The organization throughout the continent of a wide movement of solidarity . . . capable of supporting the development of revolutionary strategy in a systematic and permanent way.

Arismendi: The union of all the organizations and parties that fight in the arena of Latin American liberation along the channels of unity.

Question: Is there only one way or are there many ways to fight imperialism?

Cepeda: We are against formulating a single line. . . . We [propose] a combination of all the methods of struggle.

Dorticós: If someone wishes to discuss whether, in most conditions in this continent the only way, either today or in the near future, for the liberation of the peoples is or is not the armed struggle, it would be enough to explain to him that there is someone who does not have the slightest doubt that the armed struggle is the only way. That someone is United States imperialism.

Arismendi: It would be absurd to believe that Latin America offers a dull and uniform picture where a dry formula for liberation can be worked out for each country.

Cepeda: We do not exclude the use of all the expressions of struggle of the masses. Civic action is not an obstacle to armed struggle; they complement and support each other.

Prada: The peoples of America have already decided the road they will take. . . . The road of armed struggle is inevitable.

Cepeda: We will not waste even a tiny particle of legal action while we can.

Arismendi: In general it will be an armed revolution . . . [but] it is particularly dangerous not to see the strategic unity of the historical process.

Dorticós: And if imperialism chooses violence and armed struggle, who can deny the peoples and argue with their militant revolutionary vanguards who are intelligent, capable, and worthy of these qualifications, the right to choose revolutionary violence, revolutionary armed struggle as the suitable, dramatically inevitable reply?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cepeda: This violence will have many forms of expression.

Question: Though disagreeing on the kind of violence, you thus all do agree that it is ultimately inevitable and desirable?

Arismendi: No. Revolutionaries are not anxious for violence. We want a world in which it does not reign, once the causes that engender it—exploitation in all its forms, of man by man, of one class by another, of a nation by another—no longer exist. In Uruguay we have said many times before that we wish to follow the least painful road; but we know we are in Latin America, that imperialism is threatening us, and that our people's struggle will be hard and difficult, and that it is already a bloody one.

Prada: Let us not worry too much about the opinion of others who, while claiming to represent [the peoples], are frightened by the revolutionary thrust, hesitate to march in the front ranks, and are reluctant to be replaced by those who are willing to fight until final victory.

Cepeda: The tactics of the enemy are manifold. He does not put into practice one but several lines of action. The tactics of the Latin American popular movement will also have to be manifold.

Prada: This is the time of great definitions. The question is to determine whether we are willing to lead the revolutionary process on to the achievement of true and complete victory or whether, on the contrary, we are willing to lead it into stagnation and regression.

The Communist parties of the world apparently chose "regression." On July 30, for example, *Pravda* published an article by Luis Corvalan, head of Chile's Communist Party. In it, Corvalan told Castro to stop his meddling, denounced the *fidelista* line as "adventurism," and warned that any criticism of any Communist Party by any revolutionary was "a gift to imperialism." Then, on August 4, *L'Humanité*, organ of the French Communist Party, blasted Prada and the other OLAS hard-liners as "worshippers of the Peking line." That same day, the Ecuadorian Communist Party, in its official weekly *El Pueblo,* explained that it had refused to attend OLAS because the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference contradicted the 1964 decisions of Latin American Communist Parties to let each country adopt its own way of struggle.

These criticisms did not soften Havana. On the contrary, Cuba and the hard-liners pushed through a resolution condemning the Venezuelan Communist Party leadership as "opportunistic," "reformist," and "serving the interests of imperialism." Only El Salvador, Bolivia, and Uruguay, whose delegations were dominated by traditional Communists, voted against the resolution. The next day, another resolution, which was meant to remain secret to the outside world, blasted Russia for giving financial and technical assistance to Latin American countries governed by oligarchies. And finally, in his August 10, OLAS-closing, four-hour speech, Fidel brought his gripes against Russia out into the open: "If internationalism exists, if solidarity is not just a word, the least we can expect of any state of the socialist camp is that it will lend no financial or technical assistance of any type to those [oligarchic] governments."

At that point all but a handful of the 5,000-odd delegates, observers, guests, and ordinary Cubans who had packed the Chaplin Theater in Havana's once fashionable Miramar section jumped to their feet and cheered. On the stage behind Fidel were the chairmen of the delegations from all 27 countries, among them Cepeda, Arismendi, and Communist leaders from Chile, Bolivia, and El Salvador. They did not applaud. Nor did the observers from Eastern Europe sitting in the audience. Next to Arismendi was Raúl Castro. When he noticed that the Uruguayan Communist was standing stiffly, his arms crossed, Raúl shot his clapping hands high above his head and laughed. The audience went wild. And as the television cameras focussed first on the tall, immobile, lanky Uruguayan, then on the short, rocking, beaming, Cuban *comandante,* all Cubans finally understood that the Left in Latin America, indeed in the world, had come to an irreconcilable split. There now existed two clearly delineated camps—the revolutionaries and the others.

And still, Fidel was not through. These parties, he said when he resumed his speech, belong to a world-wide conspiracy

(*Continued on page* 34)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

CHRISTMA

Biggest Book Bargain

All cloth books. Minimum order $5. Buy $10 worth and add ar

$1.00 (List Price Range $2 to $5!)

1. A PHILOSOPHY OF MAN by Adam Schaff. An exploration of the nature of the "eternal problems" of human happiness, freedom, and responsibility by the noted Polish scholar.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $1.00

2. CHINA TRIUMPHS by Julio Alvarez del Vayo. Eye-witness account by the former Foreign Minister of the Republican Government of Spain.
LIST $5.00 ..... BARGAIN $1.00 (7s.)

3. THE ROAD TO SPAIN by Ira Morris. "An attractive, delightful, and profound novel."—Carleton Beals.
LIST $4.95 ..... ONLY $1.00

4. BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders. Preface by Bertrand Russell and Foreword by Robert Jungk. Famous correspondence.
LIST $4.00 ..... BARGAIN $1.00

5. PAUL A. BARAN: A COLLECTIVE PORTRAIT edited by Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman. The life and work of one of the outstanding Marxist political economists of our time.
LIST $3.50 ..... SPECIAL $1.00 (7s.)

6. MARXISM OF OUR TIME by Gilles Martinet. A critical look at Marxist theory.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $1.00

7. THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE by Heinz Abosch. Relates the development of German society to the economic, social, and moral problems of our time.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $1.00

8. IN PLACE OF FEAR by Aneurin Bevan. "Elucidation by an authentic voice of British socialism."—Library Journal.
LIST $4.50 ..... SPECIAL $1.00

9. PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray. The relationship of patriotism to capitalism, socialism, communism, and civil liberties.
LIST $4.00 ..... ONLY $1.00 (7s.)

10. REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHER POEMS by John Beecher. Collector's item. Beautiful Xmas gift.
LIST $3.00 ..... ONLY $1.00 (7s.)

11. THE MAN AT THE DOOR WITH THE GUN by Cedric Belfrage. The "man at the door" is the revolutionary of Latin America who can—and will—use his gun to set off a continental explosion.
LIST $4.50 ..... ONLY $1.00

12. THE ORDEAL OF BRITISH GUIANA by Philip Reno. Background picture.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $1.00 (7s.)

13. REVIEW I edited by Frances Kelly. MR's cultural supplement. "Impressively high standard." Tribune (London)
LIST $3.00 ..... ONLY $1.00 (7s.)

14. THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX by Stanley Moore. Traces back to Marx some of the issues currently dividing the USSR and China.
LIST $2.25 ..... SPECIAL $1.00 (7s.)

15. THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN CUBA by J. P. Morray. Shows how the development of the Cuban Revolution after January, 1959, changed the ideology and character of the regime to one of socialism and Marxism-Leninism.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $1.00 (7s.)

16. MARXISM AND MORAL CONCEPTS by William Ash. Marxist ideas in ethics and morality.
LIST $3.50 ..... SPECIAL $1.00 (7s.)

$2.00 (List Price Range $5 to $6!)

17. MERRIE ENGLAND by Robert Blatchford. Originally published in 1894, this great classic of radical thought sold over two million copies in England and the U. S.
LIST $5.00 ..... ONLY $2.00

18. REVOLUTION IN SEATTLE by Harvey O'Connor. A stirring account of great deeds by great men narrated by a participant.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $2.00 (14s.)

19. NEWS FROM NOWHERE by William Morris. In this book, the famous 19th-century English writer, artist, and revolutionary presents his vision of a socialist utopia.
LIST $5.00 ..... BARGAIN $2.00 (14s.)

20. THE SOCIALIST REGISTER, 1964, edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville. The first of a series of annual volumes concerned with problems of socialist theory and contemporary politics. The range is world-wide and the contributors are drawn from many countries.
LIST $6.00 ..... ONLY $2.00

21. THE SOCIALIST REGISTER, 1965. The second volume.
LIST $6.00 ..... ONLY $2.00

22. THE SOCIALIST REGISTER, 1966. The third volume.
LIST $6.00 ..... ONLY $2.00

23. SPECIAL—All three volumes for only $5.00!

All orders must be postmar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK SALE
in MR Press History!

$1 book free; $20 worth and add $2 worth of books free, etc.

$3 (Range $6 to $7.50!)

24. CAPITALISM AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP by Oliver C. Cox. Problems of change and transition in American capitalism brilliantly analyzed.
LIST $6.00 ..... NOW ONLY $3.00

25. WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harvey O'Connor. A survey of the world industry.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

26. CAPITALISM AS A SYSTEM by Oliver C. Cox. A theoretical analysis of the evolution of capitalism from its earliest beginnings by the Professor of Sociology at Lincoln University whose previous MR Press book, "Caste, Class, & Race" won the George Washington Carver Award.
LIST $6.50 ..... $3.00 (21s.)

27. WE, THE PEOPLE by Leo Huberman. A famous history of the U.S. with 58 illustrations by Thomas Hart Benton.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $3.00 (21s.)

$4 (Range $6.75 to $8.50!)

28. FOUNDATIONS OF CAPITALISM by Oliver C. Cox. The classic account of the origins and development of the capitalist system.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $4.00

29. LANDS ALIVE by René Dumont. The world-famous Sorbonne agronomist reports on his findings in more than a dozen countries in Latin America, Africa, India, and Eastern Europe.
LIST $6.75 ..... BARGAIN $4.00

30. THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley. The history of the Chinese Revolution graphically narrated via the biography of Chu Teh. "It fully deserves reading by all interested in gaining insight into one of the great social metamorphoses of human history."—Edmund Clubb
LIST $6.75 ..... ONLY $4.00 (28s.)

31. FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray. The arguments of both sides explained and evaluated.
LIST $8 50 ..... SPECIAL $4 00 (28s)

32. WASTE by Danilo Dolci. "Probes the depths of Sicilian misery and despair with telling effect."—Saturday Review
LIST $6.75 ..... SPECIAL $4.00

33. A NEW WORLD IN THE MAKING by Danilo Dolci. The famous Italian author and sociologist journeys to the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Senegal, and Ghana seeking the answer to the question: What are the criteria for a new life?
LIST $7.50 ..... ONLY $4.00

34. THE TIMELY RAIN: TRAVELS IN NEW TIBET by Stuart and Roma Gelder. "Both news and history to enrich man's knowledge of revolutionary Tibet."—Edgar Snow. The color photographs and black and white pictures, in addition to the story "told with honesty, humor, and compassion," make this big handsome book a superb Xmas gift.
LIST $8.95 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from page* 31)

against Cuba, against true revolutionaries who lay down their lives for the cause. Fidel then went on with increasing harshness, saying, in effect, that these parties who mouth the coexistence line, these parties who defend Russia's opportunism, who refuse to condemn Venezuelan Communist Party's betrayals, who sit here today not daring to applaud the true meaning of revolutionary solidarity, these parties belong to an "international Mafia" whose ultimate goal is not the revolution but, on the contrary, its destruction.

The traditional Communists did not walk out. But the split is inevitable. The new revolutionary vanguards of Latin America no longer expect help from any Communist Party. They have formulated new concepts, they are seeking out new leaders, they are establishing new tactics. It is very significant that the two heroes of OLAS whose photos were plastered all over the Havana Libre, were not Karl Marx and Lenin but Simón Bolívar and Che Guevara—he who in the past proclaimed a revolution of all the Americas against the domination of Spanish imperialism, and he who today leads the revolutionary struggle also of all the Latin Americans against the domination of United States imperialism. Both men saw the struggle as long, hard, and bloody. And both men thought they could win against superior odds and weaponry simply because theirs was the side of justice. Bolívar was right everywhere on the continent. Che has already been proven right in Cuba and is doing well in B

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bra

during my six-week stay in Cuba, during which I toured the whole island, I had the opportunity to talk to such volunteers. Their spirit was high, their fervor genuine—whether they were hoeing *malangas* or planting coffee trees. They have no patience with the dullness and rigidity of bureaucrats who are constantly being weeded out of the offices. Cuba's youngsters thirst for knowledge and never fear controversy. They read Trotsky and even Schlesinger. They enjoy pop music and look at abstract art. They criticize their old press and are developing new journalistic concepts (and a new newspaper, *Juventud Rebelde* or "Rebellious Youth," which in its first year of existence has shown amazing flexibility). They discuss their mistakes, face their problems, and criticize their mentors. They admire the United States New Left and are more interested in the discussions that take place in New York's Free University than in Moscow's numerous academies. They are armed and want to follow Che into the battlefields of the Americas, but they know they must let the peoples of the Americas do the fighting while their own task is to continue the revolution at home. Cuba's revolutionaries don't talk very much about the Permanent Revolution—but they live it.

Here in Venezuela you have the right to do what you like with your capital. This right is dearer to me than all the political rights in the world.

—*A U. S. businessman on the oil in Venezuela, Time, September 21, 1952.*

It was officially asserted . . . (by the President in a news conference on June 17) that "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off." There is no evidence to support this statement.

—Senator J. W. Fulbright, in a comment on U.S. handling of the Dominican crisis, September 15, 1965

He who witnesses a crime in silence, commits it.

—*José Martí*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANON REVISITED

JOHN A. EHRENREICH

Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. — LENIN

The writings of Frantz Fanon have become a bible to the new American revolutionaries, black and white. But although he is widely quoted, little attention is paid to the context of his observations or to their relevance for revolution in the United States. I would like here to examine Fanon's thought in the context of the experiences that engendered it—colonialism and the Algerian war for independence.

Two principal strands of thought and experience merge to create Fanon's mature thought. Fanon was a psychiatrist with experience in treating a colonized people both before and during the struggle for independence, and he was a propagandist and theorist of a nationalist revolution. In his early writings (*Black Skin, White Masks* and the early essays of *Toward the African Revolution*), Fanon is still primarily the psychiatrist. He is concerned with the psychological correlates of colonial oppression. He seeks to analyze the way in which oppressive economic, political, and racial relations work themselves out in human personality. Fanon avoids the trap of the conventional bourgeois psychiatrist: he knows he is not dealing with universal psychological responses but rather with an historically evolved and ultimately economically and socially determined response. Nevertheless, although he pays lip service to the necessity of struggle to end exploitation and oppression, he is primarily concerned with individual psychological liberation. "I am not the slave of the Slavery that dehumanized my ancestors," he says. "I am my own foundation. And it is by going beyond the historical instrumental hypothesis that I will initiate the cycle of my freedom." It is through *analysis* of the distortion of the personality of the oppressed that he hopes to dissolve the warped "psychoexisten-

John Ehrenreich is a graduate student in biology.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tial" complex. Such psychological liberation is at least potentially available to an individual independently of the individual's participation in struggle against oppression and independently of any objective change in his circumstances. Psychological liberation is logically, temporally, and historically prior to actual liberation. This aspect of Fanon's thinking, more muted in his later works, is one of the high points seized upon by some black radicals.

Within a few years Fanon was serving as doctor, propagandist, and diplomat for the Algerian FLN. In his essays in the FLN organ *El Moudjahid,* reprinted in *Toward the African Revolution* and in *Studies in a Dying Colonialism,* his understanding of the psychological changes referred to above is deepened and refined by his experience. It is here that we find a series of brilliant studies of the reaction of the oppressed personality to the experience of participating in a violent revolution against his oppressors. Fanon studies such things as the changing structure of the family and of roles within the family, the changing response to such products of modern civilization as the radio and medical care, and the psychological effects of betraying the revolutionary cause. He is studying, in short, the transformation of apathetic, oppressed people into militant revolutionaries. At the same time his awareness of the political, military, and diplomatic aspects of the struggle is also refined and developed. He examines such phenomena as Pan-Africanism, negritude, the responses of France and of Africa to the struggle, and nationalist responses to compromise proposals.

Several tendencies in Fanon's thought emerge directly from this experience. First, a strictly nationalist cast is put over his thought. The Algerian revolution is essentially a nationalist one. It is a common struggle of many segments of the Algerian people against a common racial and national enemy. It involves, superficially, two "classes"—foreign oppressor and native oppressed. The internal class struggle is overwhelmed, at least temporarily, by the unity of the national struggle. Since for Fanon the psychological aspect is all important, and since the warping of the personality of the oppressed extends to all classes within the oppressed society, this glossing over of class differences is reinforced.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, the psycho-social changes Fanon observes seem to follow more or less automatically from the exigencies of the struggle. There is no articulation of the changes, no intermediary educating of the Algerians in the new ways of acting and being. Conscious education, program, ideology play only the most limited, tactical roles. Since the revolution holds little by way of liberated territory it can systematically attempt to change, and less by way of theoretical unity (save for the ultimate goal of liberation and "social justice"), necessarily these automatic responses are what Fanon observes and is impressed by.

With the early psychoanalytic thinking of Fanon refined by his experience of the Algerian revolution, the mature thought of Fanon emerges in *The Wretched of the Earth* and some of the last essays of *Toward the African Revolution*. First of all, says Fanon, the oppressed man is warped psychologically. He has come to see himself as the oppressor sees him. Thus even his personality is a warped reflection of the oppressor's. But to build a just, humanistic society requires men who are fully men. Thus psychological rehabilitation is a top priority for a revolutionary group. More important, to resist the oppressor, to undertake the political and military tasks of overthrowing the oppressor, requires men who are not psychologically dependent on the oppressor. So psychological change is a necessary condition for revolution altogether. Second, says Fanon, this psychological change is as much a product of, as a prerequisite of violent struggle against the oppressor. Resistance creates a new man, a man proud in his consciousness of his manhood, proud of his culture, who demands social justice and who will accept nothing less. Finally, says Fanon, the new men created by the struggle are the insurance that the struggle will proceed to its proper ends. They are no longer capable of being fooled by "the demagogues, the opportunists, and the magicians" who promise justice but never give it. They will create out of the best of their past a new and humanistic society, crushed neither by the presence of the former European masters nor by the weight of European culture.

There are several conclusions revolutionaries can draw from this schema: The power of an oppressing class is wielded as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much through its control over the personality and culture of the oppressed as through its primary means—violence or the threat of it. To change the warped psychology of the oppressed is a prime prerequisite for revolution. But this change can not be separated from the carrying out of the revolution itself, since people are changed deeply by the revolutionary experience itself. Action for the sake of action, confrontation with the enemy *per se* are thereby justified. Further, violence is inherent in the old, oppressive society. Since the redirecting of this violence toward the oppressor is both a means of struggle and a powerful means of creating the desirable changes in personality, violence by an oppressed people is not only necessary but desirable: violence by itself, without any reference to its goal, is justified. Finally, none of this suggests any need for ideology, program, theory. Such things are neither necessary to initiate the struggle, to create the needed personality changes, nor to shape the post-revolutionary society. Rather it is necessary to rely on the more or less spontaneous understanding of the masses, as it develops in the course of the struggle.

We can now see the roots of Fanon's thinking in his psychologically oriented observations of the Algerian revolution. But the Algerian revolution went on after Fanon's death, and it did not proceed in the way he would have predicted. There is nothing in Fanon's analysis that enables us to understand what has happened in Algeria. This is not due to any omission, neglect, or historical inaccuracy on Fanon's part. He simply denied the importance of certain features of the Algerian situation which have become critical in understanding what has happened. What did happen in Algeria? We first must re-emphasize that the Algerian revolution was not primarily a social revolution but rather was a nationalist revolution, both in leadership and in program. The post-revolutionary governments, both of Ben Bella and of Boumedienne, have by no means carried out a thoroughgoing restructuring of the country. The Algerian people, in whom Fanon placed so much hope, have not created the new humanistic society, have not leapt into a liberated existence either psychologically or materially. Without making an extensive analysis of what happened in Algeria and why, it is clear

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the balance of power did not remain in the hands of a self-consciously revolutionary peasant and worker force. For a variety of reasons it passed to a significant extent into the hands of the Algerian middle class. Although the latter, both from its own class interest as a national bourgeoisie and from the relative weakness of its control over the workers and peasants, may talk a lot about socialism, manifest opposition to American imperialism, and may make a certain number of substantial internal reforms, this should not disguise the actual balance of power. Fanon's failure to make a class analysis of the Algerian revolution blinded him to this possibility. Further, neither violence *per se* nor mass struggle created either the consciousness or the organization among the Algerian people that could have altered this situation. Ideology was abandoned to the nationalists (and primarily to the leadership outside the country, where Fanon was). Needless to say, this meant that worker and peasant demands were subordinated to bourgeois nationalist demands.

The concept of ideology developing within the guerrilla struggle rather than prior to it has been defended since Fanon, notably by Régis DeBray, using Cuba as example. But DeBray makes a detailed analysis of a particular kind of revolution in a particular set of circumstances. It is, among other things, a revolution which is ideologically motivated in its inception if not ideologically fully developed. DeBray by no means raises the mechanism by which ideology enters the revolution to a universal and automatic process. What is more, DeBray's analysis itself is ideologically arrived at—it represents a triumph of ideology rather than its abdication to chance. In any event, it seems clear that we must scrutinize very closely the circumstances under which the revolution proceeds along a desirable path. It certainly does not happen automatically, as Fanon would suggest and as Algeria disproves.

Fanon's strength is in writing of the nationalist phenomenon he is rooted in. His analysis is based on nation and race, not on class. He has little notion of what a class is or of the role it plays. He therefore is unable to distinguish clearly between nationalist struggle and class struggle, between colonialism and imperialism, between political revolution and social revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Further, he is dominated by his psychological bias. He sees only an automatic mechanism by which revolution creates the consciousness and ideology appropriate to it. He gives priority to the psychological change rather than to the struggle. He fails to see that the kind of action engaged in affects the kind of psychological change that occurs.

Fanon sees clearly that to make a revolution, changes in the psychology of the oppressed are necessary, and that these changes are as much a result as a cause of revolutionary struggle. To be a radical, says Fanon, one must act radically. Waiting for all the details of the revolution to be worked out in advance, in isolation from the struggle, is a bourgeois hangup. The duty of a revolutionary, he agrees, is to make a revolution. But he says this in the most general and most primitive sense—it is true for any revolutionary, any revolution.

He tells us nothing of how to make a particular kind of revolution. It is only in the crudest sense of "us against them" that his theories can be considered adequate—a sense which a nationalist revolution more or less fits.

It is when we lift Fanon out of his context that we get into trouble. In the United States, where we are confronted with the problem of class revolution, not nationalist revolution, we need the tools of class analysis. In the United States, where confrontation is as likely to lead to co-optation as to repression and where struggle is often diverted toward trivia rather than toward understanding the nature of the society, intuitive understanding is not enough. For America, where the goal of revolution must be more complex than national political liberation, Fanon is inadequate. For the United States, perhaps, we must make a new slogan: The duty of a socialist revolutionary is to make a socialist revolution.

No brute ever does a cruel thing—that is the monopoly of those with the moral sense. When a brute inflicts pain he does it innocently; it is not wrong; for him there is no such thing as wrong. And he does not inflict pain for the pleasure of inflicting it—only man does that.

—*Mark Twain*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON CHANGING THE WORLD: A REPLY TO KARL MILLER

BY HERBERT MARCUSE

The review of *One Dimensional Man*, written under the pseudonym of Karl Miller (MONTHLY REVIEW, June 1967) would not deserve a reply, were it not for the fact that it appeared in MONTHLY REVIEW, a magazine devoted to the development of independent socialist thought. In my view, this task demands the rebuttal of all attempts to stifle socialist thought by the uncritical use of concepts inadequate to the understanding of prevalent social forces and tendencies. I have been anxious to see a critique of *One Dimensional Man* which would have shown that I was wrong, that I overrated the cohesion and power of advanced capitalism and underrated the strength and the prospects of the opposition. Karl Miller offers the caricature of such a critique: he misrepresents my position, builds up straw men which he then violently attacks, pours out angry invective instead of engaging in a substantial discussion. His arguments fall, roughly speaking, into two categories:

(1) That I do not know the facts, or disdain facts altogether, or don't give "details" and "evidence," or don't ask the "relevant and important questions" (the relevant and important questions being those which the reviewer considers relevant and important). In short, that I am stupid. Now this may well be the case, but I don't think that Karl Miller has proved his point.

(2) That my position leads to "quietism" and is therefore detrimental to a theory which aims at radical social change: in other words, my position contributes to strengthening the established system rather than the opposition.

My critic deems it necessary to remind me of Karl Marx's "dictum" that "philosophers have only interpreted the world in

---

Herbert Marcuse, the distinguished professor of philosophy, is currently teaching at the University of California, San Diego.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

various ways, the point, however, is to change it." He contends, that I reverse this proposition. It so happened that it was with this "dictum" in mind that I wrote the book—an intention which may indeed be entirely lost on a reader who imputes to me the claim that the world cannot be changed (p. 57). Only an unwillingness or inability to read without preconceptions can lead to this conclusion. And it is precisely recognition of the fact that changing the world is perhaps more necessary today than ever before which should commit the socialist scholar to the uncomfortable task of comprehending and defining the conditions and prospects of change—the *new* conditions and prospects engendered by the actual development of capitalism and socialism—and to do so without fostering illusions.

In order to demonstrate that my "thesis" is not only false but contradictory in itself, Karl Miller begins with an exercise in undialectical logic—an exercise which plays havoc with the most elementary concepts of Marxian thought. Here is how he demolishes my thesis: if "the goal of radical change is to be a real alternative," "there must be agents of change." But according to my thesis, advanced capitalism "has all but perfected" the means for "taming those internal conflicts which might have made for its radical transformation" (p. 49) and thereby for taming the agents of radical change. Ergo, radical social change is no real alternative, is "not on the agenda." "On the other hand," if we cannot rule out the possibility that "more and more people" will come to feel the need for radical change, then such change is "on the agenda," and my thesis is false.

This sort of logic might do for rhetoric, but it is blind to the Marxian concept of reality and of understanding reality. Karl Miller submits to the reader and to me the profound truism that "(a) social and economic relationships are complex and interwoven, and (b) the relationship between men and their social institutions is dialectical and not linear" (p. 55). I only wish he had kept this in mind, for then he might have remembered that the reality of capitalist society is its dynamic of antagonistic tendencies at all levels, that these tendencies generate the internal contradictions of the system, and that one such contradiction is precisely that between the (precarious and tem-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porary!) containment of radical social change on the one hand, and the ever more pressing alternative of radical social change on the other. Socialist theory is the theory of *tendencies* toward change; if it cannot define the agents of change as active in a given historical situation, if in reality the objective and subjective factors do not coincide, this situation (only too well known in the history of class struggles!) does not negate the historical tendency toward change. And if, instead of trying to analyze and define the reasons for this constellation and thus to prepare for its transformation, the socialist scholar, unwilling to face the facts, sets out to present "agents of change" without grounding his presentation in a critical analysis of their position and function in the social process of production, he acts irresponsibly in view of the precarious and dangerous prospects of radical change in the present period.

Throughout his review, Miller attributes to me a position which is not mine and sometimes even the opposite of mine. A few examples:

(1) He maintains that I make the "apparatus" into a Frankenstein which is "generating and satisfying bogus needs" (p. 50), thereby imputing to me a technological determinism. In fact, however, I consider the "apparatus" an instrument of domination in the hands of the ruling classes, and I emphasize the extent to which the needs generated by it have become real needs.

(2) He maintains that I consider no "advanced society" immune to the "technological terror," "whatever the form of ownership of its productive resources" may be (p. 50 f). In fact however, I stressed the essentially different *potentialities* of the socialist societies—while at the same time suggesting that, as long as the apparatus remains an instrument of domination, the social relationships will remain repressive in spite of the different forms of ownership of the productive resources.

(3) He maintains that, in my evaluation of the conditions for change in the undeveloped countries, I engage in a "Rousseauean search for the noble savage" (p. 52). I fail to see what the notion of possible alternative ways of modernization and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrialization has to do with such a search—except being the opposite of it.

(4) He asserts that I have an "unwarranted disdain for facts as such" (p. 51)—to which I can only reply that Karl Miller must have a strange notion of facts indeed.

(5) I am supposed to apply in my analysis a simple stimulus and response relation, without pointing out to my readers that the "classically simple S-R theory" does not always "hold sway," and that such "simple causal determinism" today is rejected, as in cybernetics and information theory, in favor of "a model which integrates causal and purposive explanation" (p. 55). I admit I did not point this out to my readers, for throughout my analysis I used precisely this more complex "model" which belongs to the ABC of dialectical thinking. For example, I do not picture the people "*entering* the present industrial phase" (my underlining) as preconditioned receptacles of long standing (p. 54), but I try to show how this preconditioning occurs in the social process itself. I also try to show that this is not a one-way determination, but that the preconditioned in turn act upon the conditioners—an interrelation of systematically "purposive" character.

(6) I am supposed to present this preconditioning as "terror," whereas I stress the non-terroristic, democratic character of the one-dimensional society, in which the integration of the underlying population takes place on a very material basis of satisfaction.

But it is time to come to the one serious criticism offered by my critic, namely, my failure to pay adequate attention to and evaluate correctly the "growing Negro agitation" and the national liberation struggles in the Third World.

(a) *The Negro agitation.* Karl Miller thinks that it "could very well become the most significant countervailing trend in the United States" (p. 51). The term "countervailing trend" is vague: such trends include all those groupings and forces which allegedly balance each other in an allegedly "pluralistic society," that is to say, trends operating within the framework of the established society *without transcending it* by virtue of the respective interests, aspirations, and capabilities. My book is concerned

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

precisely with the potentially *transcending* forces, which may bring about a change *of* the established system and not within it. Even a cursory analysis of the role of the Negroes in the basic social process of production, of their organization, and of their vital interests makes it appear highly dubious that the Negro movement is an even potential "agent of change" in the abolition of the capitalist system. Moreover, it seems very likely that this system is capable of coping with the Negro agitation—not only by way of brutal suppression but also, if and when the threat becomes more serious, by making considerable concessions and improvements. That such concessions and improvements would shatter the capitalist economy and its social and political institutions is an unwarranted conclusion. After two years of spreading riots, has the system become any weaker? Is it not significant for its undiminished strength that (according to *Le Monde* of August 13/14, 1967) "in Los Angeles, a curious kind of festival, which is supposed to last six days, has opened Friday. It is meant to commemorate the bloody riots which exactly two years ago caused 34 dead in the Negro quarter of Watts. An exhibit, jazz concerts, shows are on the program. Some whites are among those taking part in this entertainment, which is taking place in the most perfect order." Is the supercilious slogan "there is a lot of money in poverty" not expressing a terrible reality? To be sure, the problem is largely one of unemployment in an economy increasingly threatened by technological unemployment, but the possibilities of retraining and of creating new jobs are still there. To be sure, also, the efforts to drive the movement toward political consciousness and goals are intensified, but can we minimize the facts that only a small minority among the Negroes themselves support these efforts, that *effective* ties with the anti-imperialist struggles in the neocolonial world are non-existent, and that the prospects are dim for a long time to come? Any declaration on our part to the effect that we support these efforts is silly and superfluous because it is self-understood, but it is our responsibility to evaluate their chances without illusions.

(b) *The underdeveloped capitalist colonies.* Here too, Karl Miller builds up the straw man which he sets out to destroy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who are the Communists, "young radicals," and liberals who "want a quiet time of it" by seeing in neo-colonialism "a purely geopolitical escapade indulged in by the Soviet Union and the West" (p. 52)? Whoever may entertain such a notion, it is not I. Moreover, Karl Miller criticizes me for failure to "see these societies as part of the capitalist world—and a vital part at that" (p. 52), only to blame me on the very same page for overrating the extent to which progress in these societies depends on the two great industrial power blocs, the capitalist and the socialist. First, it is simply false to see these societies merely as a vital part of the *capitalist* world and to remain silent on their relation to the socialist world. Secondly, in order to "prove" my failure to see them as a vital part of the capitalist world, Miller has to impute to me an unwarranted degree of silliness. When I said that the abandonment of neo-colonialism would presuppose that the United States abandon its "policy," I did not believe that a reviewer writing for the MONTHLY REVIEW would not know that such a policy is not something that "can be turned on and off" (p. 53)! Indeed, when I used the term "policy," I was aware of the elementary fact that the imperialist "policy" is rooted in the very structure of the system.

As to the substance of the argument: the national liberation struggles are certainly today the most active forces operating against the global system of capitalism. They have not yet shaken the system (MONTHLY REVIEW itself has pointed out to what extent the war in Vietnam is good business for the United States!). And their prospects? What has happened in Indonesia, the Dominican Republic, in the Congo, Nigeria, Ghana, South America? The Cuban achievement has remained isolated, it has put the rulers on guard: as far as they are concerned, it will not be allowed to happen again anywhere else—and they still have the power and the will, the ever more brutal power and the ever more aggressive will, to prevent it. For how long? I cannot answer the question, and I believe nobody can. Perhaps Karl Miller should ask for the text of Paul Sweezy's speech at the recent Congress on the "Dialectic of Liberation" (July 1967 in London): if I remember correctly, he spoke of 50 or 100 years until we can envisage independent progress in these countries. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any case, not forever—no social system is immune to change—a truism which is worth repeating. I have tried to point out the full strength of the enemy, the terrifying reservoir of power at his disposal, the present weakness of the opposition, the brute fact that organized labor in the United States does not take up the cause of radical change and thus deprives the opposition of its material basis. If this is "quietism," I profess it. But I believe it is simply the truth, or at least a decisive part of the truth, and that for all those who want to contribute to the radical transformation of an ever more inhuman social system, only a relentless evaluation of the real strength of the system will do. To be afraid of being too negative, the understandable wish to be a little more comforting and to find revolutionary forces—these good intentions foster illusions, divert and weaken the opposition, and play into the hands of the Establishment.

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

☐ 1 year $6 (foreign $7) 50s. ☐ 2 years $10 (foreign $12) 86s.
Special sub rate to students: $4 (foreign $5) 36s.

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

I enclose $.....

I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for ☐ one year
☐ two years

Name .....

Address .....

.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

PAMPHLET SERIES

	English price	U.S. price
Latin America And The Alliance For Progress by Alonso Aguilar	3s.6d.	50¢
The Commitment Of The Intellectual by Paul A. Baran	2s.	25¢
Reflections On The Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	3s.6d.	50¢
Introduction To The Political Economy Of Growth by Paul A Baran	2s.	25¢
The War In Vietnam by Hugh Deane	3s.6d.	50¢
Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	1s.6d.	20¢
Principles Of Communism by Friedrich Engels (trans. by Paul M. Sweezy)	2s.	25¢
Freedom Under Capitalism And Socialism by Leo Huberman	2s.	25¢
The ABC Of Socialism by Huberman and May	3s.6d.	50¢
Socialism Is The Only Answer by Huberman and Sweezy	2s.6d.	35¢
Economic Development, Planning, And International Cooperation by Oskar Lange	3s.6d.	50¢
Economic Aspects of U.S. Imperialism by Harry Magdoff	3s.6d.	50¢
Alienation In American Society by Fritz Pappenheim	3s.6d.	50¢
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite Or Ruling Class? by Paul M. Sweezy	2s.6d.	35¢
The Split In the Capitalist World And In The Socialist World by Sweezy and Huberman	3s.6d.	50¢
British Guiana by V. P. Vatuk	3s.6d.	50¢
Total	46s.	$6.40

PAMPHLET PACKET SPECIAL

All the above pamphlets ..... **36s. — $5.00**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Dangers of a United Europe

Periodically some novelist, scholar, or politician suggests economic, political, or cultural unity for Europe; yet in 1967 Europe is stubbornly and steadfastly divided. If, through centuries of fratricidal struggle, Europeans have failed to achieve a workable basis for unification, there must be one or more reasons of overwhelming importance that keep them divided and at each other's throats.

The major danger of unity foreseen by Europeans is the loss of identity. Europe is divided geographically, linguistically, religiously, culturally. Each area, each language or religious group, each cultural area guards its differences jealously. After centuries of hesitant, harried, suspicious, and hostile association, division, re-association, and re-division, Europe comes up with a score of sovereign states, each with a national emblem and, at least in theory, a national soul.

Between two such eras of conflict as the Napoleonic wars of 1793-1815 and the Great War, which began about 1870 and has continued to the present day, Europeans have achieved a high level of international association through trade, travel, diplomacy, cultural interchange. Then some crisis has arisen, such as a dynastic dispute or a competitive struggle for markets, raw materials, or colonies, and the fat is in the fire. Once again Europeans beat their drums, blow their bugles, unlimber their guns, take off in their tanks and planes across neighboring frontiers, and proceed to wholesale destruction and mass murder until one of the contending parties gains a victory or both are exhausted in a stalemate.

Posed in this manner, the danger which prevents European unity is the fear of uprooting cherished customs and habits, and the still greater fear that each separate ruling oligarchy in each European state will lose its privileges as well as its identity.

European unity is a danger to the personal dignity of every inhabitant who thinks of himself first and foremost as a national

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and only incidentally as a European. Europe in 1967 is still stubbornly and persistently divided. Not a baker's dozen out of every thousand dwellers on the European continent call themselves Europeans first and nationals second. The idea of Europeanism as a stage beyond nationism is still absent from almost all European public thinking.

Changing China

China's overall situation is obscure and enigmatical in the extreme. Nine out of every ten well informed Americans throw up their hands with the despairing remark: "I simply do not understand it." I would hazard a guess that well informed people in China are no less in the dark. Even on the spot, participants and observers of events are baffled by the complexities and contradictions of the Chinese situation.

As an observer from a great distance, I have no way of filling the information gap except to piece together the statements which the Chinese are making about themselves and compare them with the sketchy reports which returned visitors and personal letters are bringing out of China. Ever since the Chinese Peoples Government was declared on October 1, 1949, I have been subscribing to and reading their publications. When we were in China in the winter of 1957-1958, the Chinese authorities were planning to bring out a weekly publication that would aim to give foreign readers a rational picture of Chinese events. While we were there plans for the weekly had matured, the editors had been chosen, the format had been decided upon, and a weekly paper was produced and distributed to a selected clientele with the request that the paper be read, criticized, and if possible, improved before it made its public appearance. I received the paper, *Peking Review,* and have been getting copies irregularly past the United States postal censorship for nearly a decade. I have a file of *Peking Review* in a handy place in my study; and recently, when I was faced with the problem of formulating an explanation of Chinese developments, I went through the file. The results were illuminating.

Peking Review appeared for seven years with a line printed at the bottom of the front cover: "A weekly magazine of Chi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nese news and views." The *Review* of December 20, 1959, reported on the controversy with Indonesia, supported the peaceful re-unification of Korea, noted the 80th anniversary of Stalin's birth, and surveyed the scientific expeditions recently undertaken by China.

The *Review* of April 13, 1962, warned the United States against a nuclear power struggle, discussed the United States plan to use Thailand as a base for aggression in Southeast Asia, reported on French moves in Algeria, and told the story of the first all-Chinese-built modern textile machinery plant. The October 12, 1962, *Review* commented on Chinese-Vietnamese solidarity against United States imperialism, reviewed the Chinese-Nepalese boundary treaty, accused New Delhi of double dealing on the boundary question, and reminisced on the Anyuan coal strike of 1922. The *Review* of May 24, 1963, gave the full text of Liu Shao-chi's speech on Modern Revisionism at a school in Hanoi, asked what the United States is up to in Laos, and discussed the laudable performance of a detail of the Chinese army stationed in Shanghai.

On September 11, 1964, the *Review* urged cadres to carry on the revolution, reviewed a polemic on the philosophical front, urged strong support for the Indonesian Peoples struggle against Malaysia, and warned against a move to sell out the German Democratic Republic. The *Review* of February 19, 1965, printed the Chinese government's statement in support of Vietnam, speeches by Kuo Mo-jo and Chen Yi praising fifteen years of Sino-Soviet friendship, commented on a de Gaulle press conference, and anticipated a ripening economic crisis in the United States.

The October 8, 1965, *Review* reported a press conference in which Vice-Premier Chen Yi stated China's determination to make all necessary sacrifices for the defeat of United States imperialism, commented on Sino-Cambodian solidarity in fighting imperialism, and praised a revolutionary upsurge in Sinkiang. The *Review* of May 13, 1966, praised Sino-Albanian militant unity, reported on China's successful nuclear explosion, printed Premier Chou's statement on Chinese policy toward the United States, and emphasized the need for class struggle.

I have summarized this matter from eight years of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peking Review in order to indicate its outlook and the nature of its content. I picked the numbers to which I referred at random from the file. It is evident that during this period *Peking Review* has been primarily an official organ of the Chinese government and a reporter on China's international relations. So far as I am aware, during this period the *Review* printed no portraits and engaged in no personal glorification.

I turn now to the last four numbers of the *Review* which reached me on September 5, 1967. The *Review* of June 16, 1967, headlines the mass publication of Chairman Mao's works, noting on the front cover that "The infinitely brilliant thought of Mao Tse-tung illuminates the whole of China and the world." The *Review* reports mass demonstrations in support of the Arab people, and urges its readers "to stride forward along Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in literature and art."

The line "A weekly magazine of Chinese News and Views" has disappeared from the *Review*'s front cover. The inside of the front cover contains "Quotations from Mao-Tse-tung." Page one carries a full-page portrait of Mao Tse-tung, with this line printed under it: "Our great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman." The main feature story, illustrated with two pictures of Chairman Mao is headed "Chairman Mao and Comrade Lin Piao receive writers and friends from many Countries." The *Review* also prints the full text of the speech delivered by Chi Pen-yu at the celebration of the 25th anniversary of Chairman Mao's Yenan Forum lecture on literature and art. The final article in this issue of the *Review* is headed: "Our Era is the Great Era of Mao Tse-tung."

The *Review* of the next week, June 23, 1967, carries two headlines on its front cover. "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People. Mao Tse-tung" and "China's First Hydrogen Bomb Successfully Exploded." The inside front cover contains "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung." Page one carries a full-page portrait of Mao Tse-tung, underneath which is the familiar line "Our great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman." Page three is blank. Page four carries a half-page picture of "Chairman Mao, his close Comrade-in-arms Comrade Lin Piao and Comrade Chou En-lai," attending a performance of Peking opera.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The article accompanying the picture begins: "Our most respected and beloved great leader Chairman Mao. . . . At 8 p.m. when Chairman Mao walked briskly into the theatre, the band struck up *Sailing the Seas Depends on the Helmsman.* Waving their copies of the red-covered, treasured book *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung,* all the spectators gave prolonged shouts of 'Long live Chairman Mao! A long, long life to Chairman Mao!' "

The lead article, a two-page spread titled "China's First Hydrogen Bomb Successfully Exploded," begins: "Our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out as far back as June 1958, 'I think it is entirely possible for some atom bombs and hydrogen bombs to be made in ten years time.' " The second article is the full text of a speech "On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" made by Mao Tse-tung on February 27, 1957. The text occupies 18 pages of the 56-page magazine.

Subsequent articles in the same issue include: "Grasping and Defending Mao Tse-tung's Thought—the Absolute Task of Revolutionary Journalism," "Study and Propagate Mao Tse-tung's Thought to Promote the Revolutionary Cause of Asia and Africa," and "World Enters New Era in which Mao Tse-tung's Thought is the Great Banner."

The June 30, 1967, *Peking Review* has quotations from Mao Tse-tung inside the front cover, a full-page portrait of Mao on page one. Page two is blank. Page three carries a half page picture of Chairman Mao and Vice-Chairman Lin Piao receiving visitors. On the next page there is a half-page picture of Mao and Lin Piao in a theater, together with articles hailing Chairman Mao's line on literature and art, and a new department headed: "Mao Tse-tung's Thought Lights the Whole World."

In addition to *Peking Review,* I read *China Reconstructs* and *China Pictorial.* The former has been transformed completely from a magazine about China and its people to a magazine about Mao Tse-tung and his thoughts.

The two latest numbers of *China Pictorial* delivered by the Post Office (June and July, 1967) both carry front-cover pictures of Mao Tse-tung. On the June cover, Mao stands alone, on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a mountain peak, atop the world. On the July cover Mao is in the foreground, Lin Piao in the background. The inside front cover carries a comment by Mao on Norman Bethune made on December 21, 1939. Page one carries a full-page picture of Mao in an open automobile on May Day with Lin Piao standing beside him. Page three carries an inscription to Mao written by Lin Piao on May 1, 1967. Page four has a full-page picture of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao walking beside him. The next two pages carry a double-spread picture of Chairman Mao and Lin Piao in an automobile surrounded by the May Day crowds. Under the picture is this inscription: "Chairman Mao, oh, Chairman Mao! Thousands of words are not enough to express our loyalty to you! Thousands of songs are not enough to sing our praise of you! The vast ocean is not big enough to hold our love and respect for you!"

The next two pages of the June issue contain a double-spread picture of Mao and Lin in their automobile, Mao extending his hand to an admirer from the surrounding throng. The next page shows girls dancing in a circle before a large Mao portrait. Following these pictures is a long article on Mao Tse-tung's appreciation of Dr. Norman Bethune and Mao's three most read articles. Following is an article on Kweichow headed by a picture of Mao and this quotation: "Never before have the masses of the people been so inspired, so militant and so daring as at present," Mao Tse-tung, April 15, 1958.

Subsequent pictures illustrate the effects of the little red book of Mao quotations on the life and work of the Chinese people. Literally, in this number of *China Pictorial,* Mao Tse-tung's name is on every page. A picture of him carried in a procession adorns the back cover.

This brief review of three English-language magazines published in China may be summed up in two sentences. Until 1965 Chinese policy-makers were concerned with developing their country and letting the outside world know about Chinese people, their work, and their relations with the rest of the world. During the past two years they have turned their attention to publicizing, flattering, and tiresome adulation of one Chinese—Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEAVES IN THE WIND: AN INTRODUCTION

BY MAXWELL GEISMAR

On January 15, 1958, MR Press will publish a reprint of *Leaves in the Wind,* a novel by Gwyn Thomas. The following is a new introduction contributed by Maxwell Geismar, literary historian and critic, the author of a series of books on American literature from *Writers In Crisis* (1942) to *American Moderns* (1958), *and Henry James And The Jacobites* (1963).

Gwyn Thomas is a Welsh novelist whose early work, if never commercially popular, attracted many admirers, and whose more recent novels should be picked up by American publishers. In this brief space, however, I want to discuss only the present book —published in England as *All Things Betray Thee* in 1949—and what a pleasure it is to introduce such an admirable work of art.

On the surface, this is a "romantic" novel in the old fashioned tradition which carries us back, apparently, to an earlier day when literature was designed to entertain. From the very first page you know you are going to enjoy this story—it is a treat to read. But once this literary magician has caught us in his web, other things begin to happen. When the Harpist enters the little Welsh town of Moonlea in the late summer of 1835, in order to persuade his friend John Simon Adams to return with him to the wild northern hills, we are thrown into the midst of the industrial revolution. The early industrial revolution, that is, and in the pages of this novel we feel as though we are right there in the very midst of things just when they are happening. It is a unique sensation, and I just haven't read any other novel like this one.

We have heard of the land enclosures during that period, but here we see the fences being put up to drive the people off the fields and into the towns—into the factories and mines, as cheap labor. The Harpist, being a primitive and pagan being, living for freedom and pleasure, thinks the whole notion of private property

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is loony. But after he has been beat up for poaching by one of Lord Plimmon's gamekeepers, he decides there is a method in this madness. He discovers, moreover, that his friend John Simon is in love with Katherine but not sleeping with her because of her loyalty to her husband—another stupidity of civilization since two people in love should simply go off with each other. He discovers indeed that the whole town of Moonlea, nestling in the beautiful wild mountains, is a cesspool of human filth, poverty, and suffering because a few powerful men can control the whole destiny of the iron mines, the foundries and the town itself. He sees very clearly the trap of this new industrial society and he wants no part of it.

We see the whole town through his innocent eyes. We gradually get involved in the story's central struggle along with him—albeit he himself does this reluctantly, step by step, and promising himself that he will escape to his own private life of solitary freedom the next day. But we know he won't; that is the trick of the novel's technique; that is how Gwyn Thomas makes you feel the impact of the industrial revolution as though you and it had just arrived together. It is a slack time in the iron trade; the mills are closing, and the workers are being ground down even more relentlessly. The social misery increases daily, and John Simon has begun to organize the angry workers into what is in effect the first primitive union, or an army of unemployed—or a peasants' revolt. It is this social struggle, quite as much as John Simon's love for Katherine, which is keeping them in the iron chains of Moonlea.

There are echoes here of an ancient human myth, of course, of that older Edenic garden of ease which man was cast out from, and which he has never forgotten. Underneath the social conflict, so beautifully dramatized in *Leaves in the Wind,* there is an interesting psycho-cultural concept that we'll return to shortly. Meanwhile the Harpist is taken up by the tormented iron-master Penbury (who has indeed buried his workers in a pen) and his daughter Helen, and we get a picture of the upper world of Moonlea, too. We get the butler Jabez wearing his disgraceful clothes and using language that the Harpist considers insulting to the dignity of natural man. There is the baker Lemuel Stevens, the embryonic small tradesman; the hypocritical psalm-singing minister Bowen, the Dickensian law clerk Mr. Jarvis, the revengeful Wilfie Bannion, the pathetic fiddler Felix, the radical inn-keeper Abel: all in this vivid cast of early-nineteenth-century social types. There is the uncertain and brooding John Simon himself, a convert at first to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passive resistance who believes that the sheer power of the masses assembled peacefully will persuade the millowners to show mercy.

And you have the Harpist, a gem of a character. Technically speaking he is the story's "observer" whose consciousness in the Jamesian sense is meant to record the dramatic action—but who, in another twist of Gwyn Thomas's technique, steals the story. Or to put this in another way, in the verbal dialogues between the Harpist and John Simon, between pagan pleasure and social justice, the Harpist, while apparently winning each argument, is drawn by each successive "victory" another step closer to the social bond he fears and despises. It is his ruin which is recorded here, or the ruin of his personal and pagan freedom for the sake of human morality and the social compact; a "ruin" which in this ironical and subtle mode of fiction is also a triumph. If you think I am being ambiguous, just consider the closing paragraph of the novel.

> Night had fallen completely when I began the climb of Arthur's Crown, walking up the same path I had descended on my way to Moonlea. In its summit I looked down. There below me was the house of Penbury, big, smiling, living with light. I turned, walking away from Moonlea, yet eternally towards Moonlea, full of a strong, ripening, unanswerable bitterness, feeling in my fingers the promise of a new, enormous music.

Wonderful writing, for it is out of this "unanswerable bitterness," this sense of pain, sorrow, and loss, this human suffering, that the "new, enormous music" of both society and art are born. *Leaves in the Wind* is another parable of good and evil, of innocence and knowledge—but cast into the framework of civilization and its discontents. Intuitively or consciously this novelist is using the deepest cultural insights of Freud, Wilhelm Reich, and Otto Rank, among the pioneers of depth psychology; his novel discovers, or really it "lives out," their conclusions. Beneath the great moment of historical change that it describes, from peasant man to urban and industrial man, there is the older and deeper change from "natural man" to social man. It is that factor which gives such immediacy and power to this story of Welsh miners and foundrymen; and which gives it such a haunting refrain as of notes from an older world.

No wonder the Welsh countryside is so vivid in the novel, a blissful Eden compared to the fiery furnaces of the iron towns. And the animals, and the mountains. "We should be careful how

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we treat mountains," says the Harpist. "They are the best things we have." The Welsh peasants are wild beings too, not understanding the new breed of capitalist men, "their hearts sick with the need to possess." And thus the Harpist comes to distrust even that human "reason" which he sees as preoccupied by acquisitive cunning, while the deepest sensations of sexual pleasure have become the most degraded thing of all. "They'll breed more. They'll breed in a wanton uninterested way to erase the memory of their shattered peace. And kids can earn more in foundries than they ever did in fields." And yet this Harpist, this "dignified unsullied solitary," has no other choice in the end except to leave his native hills for the trap of "civilization."

If the battle is to be joined in such harsh terms, what man can bear to be alone, or rest content on pleasurable terms with himself? Just as *Leaves in the Wind* presents a completely economic view of early-nineteenth-century industrialism without an overt reference to Marxist ideology, so it embodies the most contemporary concepts of civilization and repression without a hint of psychological pedantry. As fiction, as art, as a beautiful story, it is a remarkable achievement.

MR PRESS *is proud to announce publication of*

LEAVES IN THE WIND

by GWYN THOMAS

Order it now and see for yourself why Maxwell Geismar ends his Introduction with these words: "As fiction, as art, as a beautiful story, it is a remarkable achievement."

Price on publication January 1968: . . .	**$6.50**
Prepublication price:	**5.00**
Associates price:	**3.25**

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 116 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Reprints in the MR PRESS Series

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Many Marxist scholars consider this book, first published in 1907, to be one of the two most important theoretical works on Marxism ever written by an American. (The other is **The Theory Of Capitalist Development** by Paul M. Sweezy). Certainly Boudin's work was the most important American contribution to the Revisionist controversy in the socialist movement touched off by Eduard Bernstein. An outline of the Marxian system of thought with the accent on the **system**, that is the relation of its different parts to each other and the unity of the whole, the book is an indispensable handbook for students of Karl Marx. Topics dealt with include the materialistic conception of history, value and surplus value, the labor theory of value, the concentration of capital, the proletariat and the revolution.

●

Price on publication November 30:	$7.50	54s.
Prepublication price:	$6.00	42s.
Associates price:	$3.75	27s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

●

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Classics of Radical Thought

History of the Commune of 1871

By (PROSPER OLIVIER) LISSAGARAY

This classic account of the Paris Commune, written by a soldier of the Commune, was first published in English in 1886. Translated from the French and with an introduction by Eleanor Marx Aveling, the English manuscript was revised and corrected by the translator's father, Karl Marx. Re-publication once more makes available the book Mrs. Aveling described as "the only authentic and reliable history of the Commune."

●

Price on publication November 30:	**$12.50**	**90s.**
Prepublication price:	**$ 9.00**	**64s.**
Associates price:	**$ 6.25**	**45s.**

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

The perfect gift for Christmas. Order now and save.

●

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An important contribution to historical literature from MR PRESS

The Decline of Socialism in America: 1912-1925

By JAMES WEINSTEIN

Mr. Weinstein has brought together in one volume an account of all radical organizations during the heyday of American socialism, and has discovered that far from declining after 1912 as has been generally assumed, the movement continued to hold broad appeal for masses of Americans for at least a decade thereafter. He also concludes in this exhaustively researched and carefully documented volume that the more recent failure of American socialism was at least as much due to internal troubles as to external barriers. The old Socialist Party, he points out in support of this thesis, had mass support at the polls, a powerful and widely read press, a large trade-union following, and had overcome obstacles of immigrant *vs.* "old stock," general prosperity, and Bull Moose competition.

James Weinstein has uncovered information that significantly alters the standard account of the socialist movement in the United States.—Prof. William Appleman Williams

Price on publication November 22:	$10.00	72s.
Prepublication price:	$ 7.50	54s.
Associates price:	$ 5.00	36s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution with the publication of

Through the Russian Revolution

by Albert Rhys Williams

with an introduction by Joshua Kunitz

Two great eyewitness accounts of the Russian Revolution were written by Americans—both of them colorful, detailed, authoritative—but through a quirk of personal fame only John Reed's was kept more or less continuously in print. Now the highly dramatic volume which has been called "*the* book of the Russian Revolution" is again available in this handsome facsimile of the lavish 1921 edition: 464 pages with rare photographs, color posters, revolutionary proclamations and a new biography of the author by Joshua Kunitz.

It is and will remain for all time the first book in the English language to which every writer about the Russian Revolution will turn.—Upton Sinclair.

It sets the blood tingling and keeps the eye fastened to the printed page till the end of the book is reached.—New York Tribune.

Price on publication November 7:	$12.50	90s.
Prepublication price:	$ 9.00	64s.
Associates price:	$ 6.25	44s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable)

The perfect gift for Christmas. Order now and save

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

MR PRESS

33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You can build a socialist library at half-price

by joining

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES

Membership entitles you to buy *all* MR Press books *at a discount of 50 percent off the list price.* A $10 book for $5, or a $6 book for $3 represents a considerable saving—enough to enable you to buy twice as many books.

In addition, you get

- automatic renewal of your sub for one year
- free of charge, all pamphlets published by MR Press during the coming year

Help MR Press become a university press of the Left; help the magazine extend its influence, and help yourself to some important books by joining the Associates now.

Monthly Review Associates 333 Sixth Ave. New York, N. Y. 10014

I enclose $..... Please enroll me as an MR Associate.

☐ $ 15 - $49 Supporting Associate
☐ $ 50 - $99 Sustaining Associate
☐ $100 and over Foundation Associate

Note: When we receive your enrollment, we will send you a list of selected MR Press books. Choose one and we will send it to you free of charge. All other MR Press books are yours at half the list price.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

Please make check payable to Monthly Review Associates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from inside front cover*)
books are high, and getting higher. The trend is of course common to the publishing business, but that doesn't make it any easier on the buyer. Unlike most publishers, we are able to ease the strain for at least some of our customers by selling all MR titles at half price to MR Associates. In addition we are planning a regular paperback series which should make an increasing number of MR titles available for use as regular and supplementary reading in undergraduate and graduate courses. In this connection, may we remind all readers, especially those who buy their magazines on the newsstand, that the annual Associates campaign is now on. You save and you help MR and MR Press by joining the Associates. Do it now. Details in the ad on page 64.

On the subject of newsstand sales, readers will be interested to know that the July/August issue (Debray) had the largest press run since *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution* and still sold out completely. Our newsstand dealer berated us for not printing more, and we had to agree that he was right. Now the only form in which Debray is available is the cloth book selling at $4 (except, remember, to Associates who get it for $2, which is only 50¢ more than the price of the magazine). The September issue has also sold out on the stands, and our dealer has raised his standing order. Subs are increasing too, but more slowly—not nearly as fast as we would like. To speed up the growth of subscription circulation, we are again offering Special Xmas Gift bargains at much reduced prices. Details on the back cover.

But that's not the only way we can help you solve your holiday gift problems. We are also repeating our Xmas book sale, this year on a scale and with savings greater than ever before. Prices and an order form will be found on pp. 32, 33.

We are sorry to have to record the recent deaths of two old friends and MR authors, Konni Zilliacus and Isaac Deutscher. Zilliacus died after a long illness; he was a wonderful human being and he had a full and productive life. Deutscher died suddenly of a heart attack while on holiday in Rome at the early age of 60. His biography of Lenin, on which he had been at work for several years, will be sorely missed. But even so his great biographies of Stalin and Trotsky have already assured him the status of the most distinguished biographer the international socialist movement has yet produced.

Another MR author, Staughton Lynd, is now involved in what is perhaps the most important academic freedom case in the United States today. He was offered a job as Professor of History at Chicago State College. After he had accepted and made arrangements to move to Chicago, the Illinois Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities suddenly canceled the appointment, frankly stating as the reason Lynd's militant stand against the war in Vietnam and in favor of civil rights. If the American academic community lets Illinois get away with this scandalous violation of the most elementary concept of academic freedom, then no dissenter can consider himself safe. Send contributions and inquiries to Committee on Academic Freedom in Illinois (Robert Wiebe and James Sheridan, Treasurers), c/o Prof. Alfred Young, Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb, Ill. 60115.

Our last note on an MR author is more cheerful. As we go to press word comes that a special United States court has thrown out the Kentucky sedition law under which Anne Braden and her husband Carl, executive co-directors of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, were in jail facing trial and possible long prison sentences. We are sure we speak for many MR readers in sending the Bradens congratulations and best wishes for their important work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christmas gift subs to MR *at lowest prices in our history. Here they are in American and English currencies:*

	U.S.	England
one gift sub for	**$ 5**	**42s.**
you save	**$ 1**	**8s.**

	U.S.	England
two gift subs for	**$ 9**	**72s.**
you save	**$ 3**	**21s.**

	U.S.	England
three gift subs for	**$12**	**108s.**
you save	**$ 6**	**42s.**

	U.S.	England
four gift subs for	**$14**	**128s.**
you save	**$10**	**72s.**

	U.S.	England
five gift subs for	**$15**	**140s.**
you save	**$15**	**110s.**

all additional subs at	**$ 3**	**28s.**

We will enclose a gift card signed as you direct.

These offers end on December 31; after that date the rates go back to $6 for a one-year sub in the U.S.; $7 outside the U.S.

Remember: every gift sub you send to a friend is, at the same time, a gift to MR.

And remember, too, that these special rates apply ONLY TO NEW SUBS, NOT TO RENEWALS.

●

Send your order, with payment enclosed to:

MONTHLY REVIEW
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

or

MONTHLY REVIEW
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED